

Hamilton, all of Cincinnati, protesting against the American Sugar Refining Co. taking advantage of the position occupied by it under the Food Administration to eliminate brokers in refined sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAGUE: Resolutions of the common council of Philadelphia, protesting against the taking away of the pneumatic mail service in that city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Miner, Reed & Tullock, Meriden, Conn., and Myer Leenie, New Haven, Conn., protesting against the American Sugar Refining Co. being permitted to take advantage of its position to force the placing of orders with said company; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALDOW: Resolutions of the rural carriers of Erie County, N. Y., asking that Congress provide for maintenance of equipment for rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Resolution of the Farmers' Institute Association of Shelby Township, Tippecanoe County, Ind., favoring the prohibition of the liquor business as a war measure; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 16, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray that the ministry vouchsafed to us to-day out of all the incidents of life and the conditions that surround us may be a spiritual ministry, that we may be led to contemplate the spiritual origin of life and the significance of all the facts of life in the light of its spiritual origin. Grant, we pray, that Thy gracious Spirit may be ministered unto us by the power of Thy holy Spirit within us, that we may overcome the world through our faith in Thee. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. JAMES and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

RENT OF BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of rents received from properties located on sites of proposed public buildings purchased by the Government in the city of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules and lists of papers, documents, and so forth, on the files of the Treasury Department, which are useless and have no historic value, and requesting action looking to their disposition. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The Chair appoints the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House thereof.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 3235) amending section 32, Federal farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916.

STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I present a summary prepared on the number of days lost in strikes and lockouts in the United States and Germany. The facts are based on the report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, of date December, 1917. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS IN THE UNITED STATES AND GERMANY.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, in its December, 1917, issue, declares that in the last month for which it has figures, September, 1917, 283 strikes and 7 lockouts are reported. The bureau estimates that this is incomplete and that "the number of strikes in the country probably approach 450 in the month under consideration."

It is stated that in 171 of such strikes 147,349 persons were involved; of the remaining 112 strikes no figures are available as to the number of persons involved. It is further stated with respect to the duration

of strikes that the average of the least number given is about 7½ days. The number of persons involved in lockouts is inconsiderable and may therefore be put aside. But taking the number of persons involved in 171 strikes, which is 147,349, and multiplying by the average duration of seven days, it is apparent that on this minimum at least 1,031,443 work days were lost by strike during the month of September, 1917. This, from the condition of the statistics, is obviously a great underestimate.

The same number of the Review gives the figures for strikes and lockouts in Germany, in the calendar year 1916, from volume 323 of the Statistics of the German Empire, appearing in the Bremer Bürger-Zeitung, Bremen, August 6, 1917. From this it appears that 240 strikes, affecting 124,183 workers, were reported for 1916. The Review then says:

"The real extent of labor disputes is best indicated by the number of work days lost, which is obtained by multiplying the number of striking or lockout workers with the duration of the disputes."

Not giving the average duration but evidently following this process, the Review announces a loss of 245,404 workdays by the German strikes.

It thus appears that taking an underestimated minimum as the basis of American figures and the official statistics of the German Empire, that four times as many workdays were lost through strikes in the month of September, 1917, in the United States than was lost in the whole of the year 1916, from the same cause, in the entire German Empire.

THE LABOR SITUATION.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present further a copy of a report made by the National Industrial Conference Board relating to the same subject, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

GENTLEMEN: Some months ago, at the suggestion of Mr. Howard Coffin, a committee of five was appointed by the National Industrial Conference Board to advise with him in matters relating to the economics of industry, which committee has been officially designated the advisory committee of the National Industrial Conference Board. At his suggestion we are here to present certain statements and recommendations regarding the relations of employer and employee and the adjustment of possible differences during the period of the war.

The National Industrial Conference Board is a cooperative and advisory body of representative manufacturers constituted through the selection of two members by and from each of the following national associations:

- American Cotton Manufacturers' Association.
- American Paper and Pulp Association.
- Electrical Manufacturers' Club.
- Manufacturing Chemists' Association of the United States.
- National Association of Cotton Manufacturers.
- National Association of Manufacturers.
- National Association of Wool Manufacturers.
- National Automobile Chamber of Commerce.
- National Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association.
- National Council for Industrial Defense.
- National Erectors' Association.
- National Founders' Association.
- National Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers' Association.
- National Metal Trades Association.
- Rubber Association of America (Inc.).
- Silk Association of America.
- United Typothetae and Franklin Clubs of America.

In order that the statements and recommendations which the committee here makes may be truly representative of industrial opinion, we have called to our counsel the executive heads of the foregoing 17 national associations, comprising in their membership more than 18,000 manufacturers, representatives of a majority of State associations of manufacturers, and, in addition, a large number of executive officers of industrial organizations engaged either directly or indirectly on the production of war essentials. These statements and recommendations express the unanimous opinion of this large body of representative manufacturers.

In approaching a discussion of the relation of employer and employee at this critical hour we believe we are animated by a spirit worthy of the time and place and the gravity of the circumstances, which makes an equitable and harmonious adjustment of employment relations a matter of national necessity.

The Council of National Defense has deemed this subject of such consequence that it created a committee on labor, substantially directed and controlled by representatives of the largest national unions, which, after due deliberation, issued, through its executive committee, a statement apparently intended to declare certain fundamental policies of industrial relationship which should apply during the period of the war. Perhaps the most important sentence of this statement was the declaration that "neither employers nor employees shall endeavor to take advantage of the country's necessities to change existing standards." Differences of interpretation and opinion led to a further amplification and explanation and accompanying declarations, which were indorsed by the Council of National Defense.

These were to the effect that standards of safety and service established by State or Federal law should remain in effect unless and until, under the exigencies of war, the Council of National Defense, after proper investigation, should recommend some modification as essential to the national safety. It was likewise urged that inasmuch as the standard of living was particularly dependent upon the purchasing power of wages, no arbitrary wage change should be sought through the medium of strikes or lockouts by employer or employee without affording the established State or Federal mediums of arbitration or conciliation an opportunity to adjust disputes without stopping production, and it was especially urged that "employers and employees in private industries should not attempt to take advantage of the existing abnormal conditions to change the standards which they were unable to change under normal conditions."

Despite these timely admonitions, we find ourselves entering the fifth month of war faced with unprecedented demands for war production seriously interrupted and delayed by numerous strikes and threats of strikes in every part of the country, some of which are likely to assume the proportions of a national interruption of essential service in our factories and shipyards.

Let it be clearly understood that we, without equivocation, indorse the maintenance of every necessary regulation for safety and health and the fair adjustment of wages in accordance with the American standard of living and the increasing cost of its maintenance. So far as we know the American manufacturer can and will pay any advance in wages which expresses corresponding labor efficiency. Hours of labor have been universally contracting under the influence of many causes, the chief of which has been the always increasing development of labor-saving machinery constantly multiplying the producing power of human effort. We enter the war with the average hours of labor in American manufacture, as shown by the Government manufacturers census of 1914, very considerably less than the average hours of labor recommended for either sex in British industry in the reports of the health of munition workers' committee to the minister of munitions during 1916.

We also submit that the Naval Consulting Board, reporting upon its preliminary investigation of manufacturing establishments capable of munition work found the total number to be 18,654, and that of these 16,787, or 89 per cent, were "open" shops. Of 1,950 establishments usable for the manufacture of ammunition powder and explosives, guns and gun material, gun carriages, limbers and accessories, personal military equipment, tools, gauges and punches, machine tools and aeroplanes, all but 73 are "open" shops. (S. Doc. No. 664, 64th Cong., 2d sess., p. 40.)

With respect to wages, a great body of munition production for the Government proceeds under a contract wage law, assuring at least time and a half for all overtime in excess of eight hours, so that for like tasks industrial wages for war work are universally increased by the operation of statute in every plant whose contracts come within its scope. Antecedent to our entrance into the war general wage increases in large amounts had been voluntarily given throughout the generally prosperous industries, so that it may be fairly said that our wage scale on the average was, actually as well as nominally, greatly superior to that of any belligerent country. But despite this condition and the increase by statute of wages for the subject matter of our own war production, it is inevitable that wage differences will continue to arise. The vital thing is that such disputes shall be adjusted without interruption of production necessary to national defense. To this end we believe that manufacturers are ready and anxious to cooperate in the establishment of a representative and equitable system of adjustment for the period of the war.

There are, however, other "standards" of employment than those relating to hours and wages which are of critical importance, not merely to efficient production but to the institutions of a free people. Strikes are threatened and are occurring in increasing numbers to compel the exclusive employment of union men. This, we emphatically urge, is contrary to any fair interpretation of the spirit and letter of the fundamental policy declared by the council, "that employers and employees in private industries should not attempt to change the standards which they were unable to change under normal conditions."

Can there be any doubt that to undertake to open a "closed" shop or close an "open" shop under the exigencies of war is an evident attempt "to change the standard which they were unable to change under normal conditions"? This is the view frankly presented by Mr. Thomas, the English labor representative, in his suggestions to the committee on labor of the advisory commission of the Council of National Defense, when, recommending conduct predicated upon his British experience, he declared, according to the American Federationist for August of this year:

"Let the employer say, 'I am not desirous of taking advantage of the war to break down something that I never believed in.' On the other hand, let the employee say, 'Whilst anxious to maintain the law, we are not anxious to take advantage of the war to enforce something during the war that we could not obtain in peace times.' With both sides recognizing that, I repeat, I believe they will find a solution."

Secretary of Labor Wilson apparently indorsed this view when, on April 23, 1917, in an explanatory statement on behalf of the council, he said "that where either an employer or an employee has been unable under normal conditions to change the standards to their own liking, they should not take advantage of the present abnormal conditions to establish new standards." This, we urge, declares a sound policy and a fair interpretation for the council to place upon its recommendation.

Moreover, there is a labor shortage which will necessarily be intensified by withdrawing from industry the personnel of its contribution to our armed forces. In this crisis America needs the service of every citizen. We can no more depend upon one class to operate our factories than to fill the ranks of our armies. Therefore it is inconceivable that the Government can tolerate, much less approve, any proposal which makes membership in a private organization a prerequisite to a citizen securing employment in production for the war. All citizens, union or nonunion, are equally entitled to and must receive like consideration from their Government and equally enjoy the full protection of national authority in every circumstance of daily life. The assertion is untenable that a minority or a majority of employees in any industry by voluntarily associating themselves into an organization acquire authority or right over the equal liberty of those who do not care to do likewise. As was said in a great public document:

"This all seems too plain for argument. Common sense and common law alike denounce those who interfere with this fundamental right of the citizen. The assertion of the right seems trite and commonplace, but that land is blessed where the maxims of liberty are commonplaces." (Report of Anthracite Coal Strike Commission, 1902.)

To win this war we can sacrifice everything but the principles of the Republic and the fundamental rights of citizenship it was founded to protect. The right to pursue a lawful calling and to live free from annoyance and molestation is the primary, if not the greatest, privilege which society is founded to sustain.

The British policy expressed in its munition acts is that all labor, whether it be that of employer or the employee, of men or women, of union or nonunion, of the skilled or unskilled, shall be employed to the best advantage of the country. Neither restriction nor discrimination, nor, in "controlled shops," strikes or lockouts are permitted. A ministry of munitions is successfully promoting the expeditious output of munitions by employing all the available labor to that end. With due regard to the plant and equipment of each establishment, it has successfully subordinated conflicts between employer and employee to the winning of the war.

To the same great end we propose through you, in the presence of the public, that employer and employee, organized and unorganized, shall pledge themselves to prevent strikes and lockouts, to deal rationally and unselfishly through a representative tribunal with serious wage

disputes, and for the period of the war not compel or attempt to compel discriminations in employment by strikes, threats of strikes, or lockouts.

We further submit that, under the present circumstances of national necessity, it is the duty of both the manufacturer and of organized labor to jointly cooperate with the Government that sedition in any of its manifold forms, whether masquerading in the name of labor or under any other guise, shall be ruthlessly exposed and suppressed.

To epitomize our conclusions and recommendations we urge:

1. That as a basis of mutual understanding employer and employee recognize and agree that now and for the period of the war continuous efficient production can alone equip and sustain our military forces. Every dispute, whatever its motive, which interrupts production further the ends and operates to the advantage of the public enemy.

2. The Nation needs the service of every citizen. Its industrial workers are as indispensable to victory as the soldier on the firing line. The nonunion man is as necessary in the factory as he is in the Army. On economic as well as indisputable moral grounds the Government can therefore neither permit nor tolerate the exclusion of any laborer from productive employment. We, therefore, urge the council to adopt and reassert as its guiding principle the fundamental American doctrine authoritatively stated by the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission with the approval of representatives of both employers and unions included in its membership and commended as the basis of industrial adjustments by Presidents Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson.

"That no person shall be refused employment or in any way discriminated against on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor organization; that there shall be no discrimination against, or interference with, any employee who is not a member of any labor organization by members of such organization."

3. The council's reiterated recommendation that "employers and employees in private industries should not attempt to take advantage of the existing abnormal conditions to change the standards which they were unable to change under normal conditions" should now receive an unambiguous interpretation to assure its practical application as a working principle. To this end we propose:

(a) That applied to existing statutory regulations intended to promote safety and health, it shall be agreed that for the period of the war there shall be no suspension or modification of such provisions, except upon recommendation of the Council of National Defense after due investigation by its agencies and when, in its judgment, required by the exigencies of war.

(b) Applied to wages, demands shall be tested by the prevailing local standard of the establishment in effect at the beginning of the war with such modification as may be shown to be necessary to meet any demonstrated advance in the cost of living.

(c) Applied to hours, the standard shall be those established by statute or prevailing in the establishment at the beginning of the war, subject to change only when in the opinion of the Council of National Defense it is necessary to meet the requirements of the Government.

(d) Applied to what are commonly known as "open" or "closed" shop conditions, it shall be understood and agreed that every employer entering the period of the war with a union shop shall not by a lockout or other means undertake to alter such conditions for the duration of the war, nor shall any combination of workmen undertake during the like period to "close" an "open" shop.

4. Adopting these standards as the basis of its operation, we recommend the creation of a Federal board to adjust labor disputes for the duration of the war; the activities of this board to be confined to disputes growing out of employment on the subject matter of war production for the Government. To such board shall be primarily referred for final settlement all major disputes of the nature suggested, with full power to create all machinery necessary to execute its functions. Its decisions must bind all parties to the dispute. It should be constituted equally of representatives of employees, employers, and the Government, representatives of the latter to hold the deciding voice in the event of an equal division of opinion. It is to be further understood and agreed that there shall be no interruption of production by strike, lockout, or other means within the control of employer or employee.

5. We pledge to the country through you the acceptance of such a program by the great body of representative associations and individual manufacturers we are authorized to represent. We do not seek to be regarded as the exclusive spokesman of all industry, and will cooperate in any helpful capacity with any and every manufacturer whether members of our association or not.

6. To secure in the public interest a mutual understanding and agreement predicated upon the proposals set forth, we suggest: That the Council of National Defense call, at the earliest convenient date, a conference of representative national and international officers of American trade-unions, that they may be requested to join in the pledge here made on behalf of employers. Their loyal cooperation for the duration of the war will assure a known standard of conduct to govern these vital industrial relations. The national safety will then no longer be imperiled by disputes, halting vital production and necessarily operating to give aid and assistance to the public enemy.

We reiterate in conclusion the pressing necessity for recognizing one vital and primary principle. A Government which can not itself discriminate between its citizens can not tolerate a condition which encourages private organizations to compel such discrimination. Politically and economically such a policy spells disaster. It destroys the responsibility of management which is vital to successful production and denies in our own democracy the basic principles of individual liberty and opportunity, for which its citizens since the foundation of the Republic have shed freely of their blood and for which to-day they are prepared to die on alien soil.

Signed on behalf of the National Industrial Conference Board by its executive committee and its advisory committee.

Executive committee:

LOYALL A. OSBORNE,
Chairman,
FREDERICK P. FISH,
WILLIAM H. BARR,
A. LAWRENCE FELL,
CHARLES CHENEY,
MAGNUS W. ALEXANDER,
Executive Secretary.

Advisory committee:

LOYALL A. OSBORNE,
Chairman,
WILLIAM H. BARR,
W. H. VAN DERVOORT,
C. A. CROCKER,
ELLISON A. SMYTH,
W. A. LAYMAN.

Indorsed by the following associations not members of the conference board:

California Metal Trades Association, San Francisco, Cal.
Manufacturers' Association of Connecticut (Inc.), Hartford, Conn.
Manufacturers' Association of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Conn.
Georgia Manufacturers' Association, Atlanta, Ga.
Illinois Manufacturers' Association, Chicago, Ill.
Iowa State Manufacturers' Association, Des Moines, Iowa.
Kentucky Manufacturers and Shippers Association, Louisville, Ky.
Associated Industries of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.
Michigan Manufacturers' Association, Detroit, Mich.
Associated Employers of Missouri, St. Louis, Mo.
Manufacturers' Association of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J.
Associated Manufacturers of Electrical Supplies, New York, N. Y.
Associated Manufacturers and Merchants of the State of New York, Syracuse, N. Y.
Ohio Manufacturers' Association, Columbus, Ohio.
Associated Employers of Oregon, Portland, Oreg.
Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, Philadelphia, Pa.
Steel Founders Society of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Cotton Manufacturers' Association of South Carolina, Greenville, S. C.
Tennessee Manufacturers' Association, Nashville, Tenn.
Employers' Association of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
United Metal Trades Association of the Pacific Coast, Seattle, Wash.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 940) to provide for the payment for certain lands within the former Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 194) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the resolution (S. J. Res. 104) authorizing the assistant to the Secretary of the Interior to sign official papers and documents, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 193) thereon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7697) to authorize the calling into the service of the United States the militia and other locally created armed forces in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 195) thereon.

THE "GARABED" INVENTION.

Mr. JAMES. From the Committee on Patents I report back favorably with certain amendments House joint resolution 174. It is a unanimous report of the committee, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky reports from the Committee on Patents the following joint resolution.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 174) for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, for lessening the expenses of the war, and restoring the loss caused by the war by providing for the employment of a discovery or invention called the "Garabed," claiming to make possible the utilization of free energy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a moment. I wish to ask the Senator reporting the joint resolution if there are amendments made to it protecting the interests of any other inventor who may invent something along the same line, but not to interfere with this particular process.

Mr. JAMES. The amendments by the committee declare that Mr. Giragossian is the first and original inventor or discoverer of this process. I will state to the Senator that I think it gives every protection possible. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox] drew the amendments and they were accepted by the committee and unanimously ordered to be reported by the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, before the word "discovery," to strike out the article "a" and insert "his"; in section 2, page 2, line 6, after the word "invention," to insert the words "and that it can substantially effect the purposes set out in section 1 of this resolution"; in section 3, page 2, line 14, after the word "invention," to insert the words "and that it can substantially effect the purposes set out in section 1 of this resolution"; in line 14, before the word "original," to insert the words "first and"; on the same page, line 15, after the word "thereof" and the comma to insert "and if the Secretary of the Interior accepts the assignment of the use of said invention as provided in the first section hereof"; on the same page, line 21, after the word "practicable" and the comma, to insert the words "as

aforsaid"; and in section 6, page 4, line 14, after the word "use," to insert the words "and ownership," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept, as trustee for the United States Government, from Garabed T. K. Giragossian an assignment of the right to utilize for the Government's own use his discovery or invention to be known as the "Garabed." Said assignment to and utilization of said discovery or invention by the United States Government shall be free of charge or expense.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform any and all acts, and to make such rules and regulations, and enter into such contracts as may be necessary to carry this resolution into effect: *Provided, however*, That the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian shall demonstrate the practicability of his discovery or invention and that it can substantially effect the purposes set out in section 1 of this resolution, to a commission of five eminent scientists, who shall be appointed by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian and be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The United States Government shall be under no expense in connection with the demonstration of the "Garabed."

SEC. 3. That if such demonstration shall in the opinion of the said scientists prove the practicability of said discovery or invention and that it can substantially effect the purposes set out in section 1 of this resolution, and that he is the first and original discoverer or inventor thereof, and if the Secretary of the Interior accepts the assignment of the use of said invention as provided in the first section hereof, the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian shall be recognized by the United States Government as the original discoverer, inventor, and legal owner of the invention or discovery and of any improvements pertaining thereto that may be made by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian. The certificate of said commission of scientists, to the effect that said discovery or invention is practicable, as aforesaid, and that he is the original discoverer or inventor thereof, shall constitute the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian the legal owner of and entitle him to all the rights and benefits of said discovery or invention for a period of 17 years. The right is reserved to the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian, his heirs and assigns, to take out patents for his aforesaid discovery, invention, or for any improvement or device pertaining thereto.

SEC. 4. That the United States Government shall not issue to anyone else any patent involving or relating to the distinctive principle of the "Garabed" free energy generator regardless of its form or shape, or for any device, improvement, process, equipment, or apparatus based upon the distinctive principle of the said discovery or invention, or for any improvement or change developed in the use of the said "Garabed," and shall prevent the construction, importation, use, or exploitation thereof, in whole or in part, in the United States, and shall protect the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian, his heirs and assigns, in the rights and interests in the "Garabed" in the above respect for a period of 17 years in the United States and in foreign countries where such protection is afforded by treaty obligation, international law, or diplomatic representation.

SEC. 5. That any essential improvement or contrivance by any person or persons other than Garabed T. K. Giragossian relating to the "Garabed," or its principle, which shall prove valuable and essential thereto in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior during the period of the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian's special protection shall be bought by the United States Government for its own use in conjunction with its use of the said "Garabed," with adequate compensation to the inventor or contriver thereof. If, however, the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian wishes to utilize any such invention or contrivance so acquired by the United States Government, he or his assigns, and no other person or corporation, shall be entitled thereto upon the payment of a fair, just, and reasonable royalty therefor. In consideration of this right the United States Government shall have, without expense, the right to use for its own purpose any new improvement or device made by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian.

SEC. 6. That after the successful demonstration of the "Garabed," if the United States Government wishes to purchase the right and title for the exclusive use and ownership of said discovery or invention, the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian will comply with the request of the United States Government: *Provided*, That he shall be remunerated to the extent commensurate with the value of his discovery or invention, which shall be appraised by a committee of even number, one-half of the membership of which shall be selected by the Secretary of the Interior and one-half selected by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian, and the finding of said committee shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and of the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian.

If the United States Congress in session at the time of the demonstration, or at the latest during the following session, does not decide to avail itself of this privilege, the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian's legal rights and powers shall continue unimpaired as prescribed and set forth in this resolution.

SEC. 7. That any sale, or attempted sale, by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian, or by his representatives or assigns, of any interest in or any title to said discovery or invention, or any part thereof, prior to the approval of the same by said commission of scientists, shall be illegal, invalid, and void.

SEC. 8. That the United States Government will have the right to exercise the aforesaid right to utilize said discovery or invention for its own use simultaneously with the beginning of the public and general use of the said "Garabed" system.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to have the resolution, with the amendments agreed to by the Senate, incorporated in the resolution, printed in the Record, so that it will appear in the Record as it would read if the House should agree to the amendments of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will appear in the Record as it would read if amended. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution was passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CULBERSON:

A bill (S. 3522) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 3523) to amend an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 3524) to amend the act entitled "An act to extend temporarily the time for filing applications and fees and taking action in the United States Patent Office in favor of nations granting reciprocal rights to United States citizens," approved August 17, 1916; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3525) to create a Legislative Drafting Bureau and to establish a legislative reference division of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 3526) to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916 (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3527) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States," approved March 3, 1885 (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3528) to suspend for the period of the present emergency sections 45, 46, and 56 of an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 3529) to repeal the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National German-American Alliance," approved February 25, 1907.

Mr. KING. I think the bill should go to the Committee on the Judiciary. As I understand, the charter granted to this organization was reported by the Judiciary Committee, although I may be in error. It may have been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 3530) to repeal the act approved March 1, 1913, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks, bonds, and other securities"; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 3531) for the relief of Franklin A. Swenson; and

A bill (S. 3532) for the relief of Frank Harrigan; to the Committee on Claims.

NAVAL OIL SUPPLY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The second reading of a bill.

The bill (S. 3521) to further provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States with respect to the production, use, and conservation of oil and gas in naval petroleum reserves, and for other purposes, was read the second time by its title.

Mr. SWANSON. I move to refer the bill to the Naval Committee.

Mr. SMOOT. As a substitute for that, I move that the bill be referred to the Public Lands Committee.

Mr. SWANSON. The rule is that we can not substitute one committee for another.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is well taken. The rule is that you can not substitute. After a vote on this question, if it is voted down, then motion may be made to refer the bill to some other committee.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I suppose the motion is debatable, and I wish to say a few words on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair assumed a prerogative yesterday which the Chair did not possess. The motion is

debatable, and Senators can take all day upon it, or until 2 o'clock.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I think the bill as a measure of right and justice under the rules of the Senate should go to the Committee on Public Lands. It has been an unbroken and immemorial practice to refer all measures relating to the disposition, regulation, or control of the public domain of the country, and all legislation in any way affecting the public domain of the country, to the Senate Committee on Public Lands. There have been some very sharp conflicts in this body in times past over the jurisdiction of that committee, and it has been the decision of the Senate in every case to refer all such measures to the Committee on Public Lands. There have been some contests waged along that line where the line of demarcation of jurisdiction was not nearly so clearly marked as it is in the case of this bill, but in every instance the Senate has decided in favor of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Lands.

Personally I am not anxious to have the committee of which I have the honor of being chairman handle great matters of legislation, nor am I greedy for the handling of bills. Personally I care but little or nothing about those matters, but I believe that the right of jurisdiction and the dignity of the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman should be protected in this body, and I do not believe it would be right or just or in accordance with the precedent set by the Senate nor the rules of the body to refer a bill of such great importance, which plainly affects in a very vital way the public domain of the country, to any other committee than the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MYERS. With pleasure.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask the Senator a question or two—probably one will be sufficient—to get a clear understanding of the matter before us as influencing my own action when I come to vote. I have heard the remarks made by different Senators about the jurisdiction of the committees. I agree in the main with most of what has been said on both sides of the controversy; that is, I agree to this extent, that the jurisdiction prescribed by the rules should be observed. I will state the particular question presented to me. I am told by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], and perhaps others, that certain sections of the public lands were carved out of the public domain and donated to, turned over to, given to, public uses which concern the Navy alone; in other words, given over to the Navy. Where is that tract of land, exactly?

Mr. MYERS. I know of no such tract of land about which there was any legislation at all. Large tracts of land have been withdrawn from entry—from mineral entry, homestead entry, desert-land entry, or any other kind of entry—but they are still nevertheless public domain. The United States Government is the owner of those tracts of land.

Mr. STONE. The Senator does know where the lands in question are located?

Mr. MYERS. In the State of California and in the State of Wyoming.

Mr. STONE. So I understand; in the State of California and in Wyoming. Now, I should like to ask the Senator to explain, that I may know, what would be the real difference between the Government of the United States buying a given area of land and acquiring it in private ownership for the use of the Navy? No matter whether it is a wise thing to do, assuming it to have been done, what would be the difference between that and the Government taking a certain tract of land out of the public domain and devoting it exclusively to naval uses?

Mr. MYERS. There would probably be no difference.

Mr. STONE. It seems to me that that is the question presented to us here, as I have listened to the argument.

Mr. MYERS. There would probably be no difference. That can only be done by legislation, and I know of no legislation which has set aside any part of the public domain for the exclusive use and benefit of the Navy. If there is any such legislation, I do not know of it.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, acting under the Pickett Act, in 1912, the President set aside this land for the exclusive use and benefit of the Navy, using that expression. This bill only affects that land.

Mr. MYERS. The President can not divest the United States of the title to the land.

Mr. SWANSON. The thing the President did was with governmental land. A navy yard is on governmental land. It is not public land, because it is not subject to public entry. Does the Senator contend that a navy yard is subject to the jurisdiction of the Public Lands Committee?

Mr. MYERS. No; I would not claim that, because it is not and never was public domain; but this land in California and in Wyoming always has been and is public land which belongs to the public domain.

Mr. SWANSON. The navy yard at Puget Sound was once public land subject to entry and was set aside. Does the Senator contend that legislation affecting the navy yard at Puget Sound can go to the Committee on Public Lands?

Mr. MYERS. Legislation by Congress has made that land belong to the Navy, but there has never been any legislation by Congress making this land in California and Wyoming belong to the Navy.

Mr. STONE. That is the very question I had in mind.

Mr. SWANSON. The Pickett Act confirmed and authorized what had been done and the President by the proclamation of 1912, which I can read to the Senator, said that these lands should be set aside for the exclusive use and benefit of the Navy.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHAEROTH in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator from Virginia insist that the President of the United States by any power that he has, or by any that he may usurp, may carve out a part of the public domain, and in virtue of the Pickett Act set it apart for any purpose and transfer title?

Mr. SWANSON. The Supreme Court of the United States has decided in passing upon the Pickett Act that the President of the United States, when authorized to do so as he was by the Pickett Act, has a right to set apart the Federal reserves for the use of the Navy, and he did so.

Mr. MYERS. The President withdrew those lands from public entry, but title has never been divested from the United States and no power can do that except Congress.

Mr. SWANSON. If the title goes to the Navy it is not divested from the United States.

Mr. MYERS. There has never been any legislation which would make that land other than what it always was—public domain; and the President of the United States has not the power to make it otherwise.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MYERS. With pleasure.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Pickett Act specifically authorized temporary withdrawals. That is what all the withdrawals under the Pickett Act are—temporary withdrawals. The word "temporary" is used in the act.

Mr. STONE. For what purpose?

Mr. SMOOT. For the purpose that thereafter, if Congress wants to legislate affecting the land withdrawn, Congress may do so. To now legislate upon the withdrawn area means that this bill should go to the Public Lands Committee instead of to the Naval Committee.

Not only that, but I want the Senate to distinctly understand that the statement that there are no public lands involved in the bill can not be sustained. I ask Senators to read section 4 of the bill, which refers to lands that are claimed by location by individuals in the United States. No title has yet passed, and they are public lands. Again, the Government is questioning titles that have already passed. The bill provides that in cases where it is finally decided the title should pass to the claimants an exchange for lands outside of the exterior boundaries of the withdrawal lands can be made. If that is not dealing with public lands, I do not know what can be dealing with them.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I think the statement of the matter which has been made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is very clear and is very correct.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But, Mr. President, does not the bill also deal with lands set apart for the Navy; and does not section 4 simply provide that as to lands set apart for the Navy, where claimants are upon them, can be so handled as to adjust the claimants' rights by letting them take something outside? Therefore, does not that section apply to the responsibility of the Committee on Naval Affairs as well as of the Committee on Public Lands?

Mr. MYERS. Who sets them apart for the benefit of the Navy?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The President of the United States, in pursuance of law.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator from Georgia claim that the President of the United States can set lands aside for the use of the Navy without legislation by Congress?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; but the legislation authorized it.

Mr. MYERS. It only authorized a temporary withdrawal, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has said, subject to the disposition by Congress.

Mr. STONE. Well, has the President of the United States attempted to segregate and set aside the particular lands in question exclusively for naval uses?

Mr. MYERS. That is immaterial. He had no power to do that.

Mr. STONE. I am asking for the facts, and not as to the materiality of them.

Mr. MYERS. His order attempted to do that; yes.

Mr. STONE. What President did that?

Mr. THOMAS. Two of them.

Mr. SMOOT. President Taft—

Mr. STONE. President Taft did that?

Mr. SMOOT. President Wilson also did it.

Mr. STONE. It is immaterial what President did it; I merely wanted to get the date when that was done more than the name of the President who did it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there have been temporary withdrawals for this purpose just the same as there have been as to forest reserves. Such withdrawals are made permanent only by further legislation by Congress. Does the Senator from Virginia say that the forest lands to-day are not public lands because they are withdrawn? Mr. President, it is absurd.

Mr. KING. The withdrawal operates.

Mr. SMOOT. Not only that, but the forest lands are withdrawn by direct authorization of Congress, the act giving the President the power to withdraw lands for forest purposes, while the lands withdrawn under the Pickett Act are only temporary withdrawals.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield—and it is with his consent I am turning now to interrogate the Senator from Utah—I desire to ask exactly what is meant by the term "temporary withdrawals"? President Taft, the Senator says, did temporarily withdraw these particular lands in question for naval uses. What does that mean, and what were the naval uses for which President Taft withdrew the lands? I ask that question in order to determine in my own mind whether the withdrawal was in fact to be a permanent thing or a temporary thing, so far as the President was concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Montana bear with me further?

Mr. MYERS. With pleasure.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to answer the question which the Senator from Missouri has just propounded.

When the Pickett bill was first considered in the House we had a similar bill under consideration in the Public Lands Committee of the Senate. The House passed its bill before the Senate passed the Senate bill. The House bill came to the Senate, and it was reported to the Senate instead of the Senate bill.

Mr. STONE. What importance has that?

Mr. SMOOT. I am giving the history of the matter. In the original bill the word "temporary" was not used, but in the House and in the Senate the word "temporary" was inserted in the bill, and all of the discussion upon the floor of the Senate went to the effect that it was absolutely necessary that the word "temporary" be inserted in the bill because of the fact that the legislation was simply for the purpose of withdrawing whatever lands the President of the United States thought was necessary to withdraw when considered as being required by the Government, but that the withdrawal is temporary is undenied. It was thought Congress would pass within a reasonable time legislation disposing of such withdrawn lands or should return them to the public domain. That is the history, I will say to the Senator, of the insertion of the word "temporary" in the Pickett Act. I know the character of the hearings before the committee and the recommendations which were made by those who were interested in the legislation.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MYERS. With pleasure.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is utterly mistaken in his position. The Supreme Court of the United States has expressly decided these questions in the case of the United States against The Midwest Oil Co., in Two hundred and thirty-sixth United States Reports. Let me read a paragraph from the syllabus of the opinion, as follows:

There is no distinction in the principle between the power of the Executive to make reservations of portions of the public domain and the power to withdraw them from occupation.

Now, what are the facts? I want to show to the Committee on Public Lands how they have attempted by legislation to nullify the act of the Executive.

Mr. SMOOT. In what respect?

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will be patient, I will point that out to him. In 1909, at the instance of the Geological Survey, owing to the fact that a number of men were occupying and seizing oil lands in California and other States, the Executive issued an order withdrawing those lands from location and entry. The men who were trying to capture those public lands paid no attention to the order, but disregarded it and said it was illegal.

In 1910 legislation in regard to the question came before Congress, an intimation having been made that the President had no right to issue such withdrawal order; that it was not within the scope of his authority to do so. So a bill was introduced in Congress to clear up the situation. The bill giving the President the power of withdrawal passed the House and came over to the Senate. That bill came before the Committee on Public Lands, and a majority of that committee made a report, stating that the President from the very beginning of our land system had the power and the right to withdraw public lands from settlement and set them apart either for military or other reservations. In the face of that order of withdrawal, and in the face of the report of the committee, the men seeking the land went to work and filed claims on the lands which had been withdrawn.

Finally, growing out of the matter, a case went to the Supreme Court, the case I have already cited, and the Supreme Court decided that the President of the United States had always possessed the right of withdrawing the public lands and creating reservations. In that decision a multitude of cases were referred to, as was the report made by the Public Lands Committee in February, 1910, and the views expressed by the committee in that report were concurred in by the Supreme Court of the United States.

What has been done by the legislation which has been recently passed by Congress? It has attempted to nullify that withdrawal order. Let me read section 16 of Senate bill 2812, passed by the Senate last week. Unfortunately, I was laid up by an accident, for otherwise I should have been present and discussed it. Section 16 of that bill reads:

SEC. 16. That upon relinquishment to the United States within 90 days from the date of this act or within 90 days after final denial or withdrawal of application for patent, by a claimant of any claim or subdivision thereof—

Now, listen to this—

asserted under the mining laws prior to July 3, 1910—

That carries it a year past the President's order of withdrawal—

to any unpatented oil or gas lands included in any order of withdrawal and who prior to such date had performed all acts necessary to a valid mining location thereof—

I will not read further from the bill, but I have read enough to show that it gives the men who, in the face of the order of the President and in utter disregard of it, filed on these public lands, a prior right to lease them. Now, does not the Senator from Utah see the situation? These men had bid defiance to the order of the President; they went on those lands and are on them yet, and the bill to which I have referred proposes to give law violators a priority of right to lease these lands. That is all there is in the section of the bill from which I have quoted, and the Senator from Utah ought to know it.

Mr. SMOOT. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. And will the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] yield?

Mr. MYERS. I will.

Mr. SMOOT. All that the Senator has said has nothing to do with the subject before the Senate or what I have stated. Mr. President, the withdrawal order of President Taft of July 3, 1910—

Mr. NELSON. Nineteen hundred and nine.

Mr. SMOOT. Nineteen hundred and nine, was the first withdrawal order, but the order of 1909 is not mentioned in the bill of the Senator from Virginia, the reference of which is under discussion. I will say to the Senator that the withdrawal order was made in July, 1910, after the passage of the Pickett Act, because President Taft himself expressed the opinion that all withdrawals of oil lands in the United States made before the passage of the Pickett Act, in his opinion, were doubtful.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senator, with all due respect, if he will yield to me, is mistaken.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly, I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. The President did not say that he doubted it, but he said that it was questioned by others, and it was to remove that doubt that the Pickett Act was passed. President

Taft was too good a lawyer to say that he himself doubted it; he merely said it was questioned by others.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not particularly care how often the Senator from Minnesota may say, "I am mistaken, but I am not mistaken, for President Taft himself told me he had doubts on the question. There is no need of discussing the question, however, as to whether President Taft's opinion was right or whether it was wrong; the administration at that time wanted the Pickett Act passed, and it was passed, and in that act were written the words "temporary withdrawal."

As to section 16 of the bill referred to by the Senator from Minnesota, which passed the Senate last week, and injected into this discussion, I understand was a bill drawn by the department. I will say further that I did not vote for that bill, but voted against it.

Mr. NELSON. Well, that is to the Senator's credit.

Mr. SMOOT. The only question before the Senate is whether the bill introduced by the Senator from Virginia dealing with public lands should go to the Committee on Naval Affairs or to the Committee on Public Lands. The bill recognizes the locations that were made before the withdrawal order of July, 1910, and it provides for the exchange and payment for such lands, in case an investigation shows that the locations were made properly and the locators have complied with the law that they can even exchange such lands within the exterior boundaries of the withdrawal for lands within the public domain.

I am not discussing the wisdom of the provisions of the bill because I am in favor of the legislation, and if it should be referred to the Committee on Public Lands I would vote for it. But what I am discussing is the question of referring to the Committee on Naval Affairs a bill that deals with public lands. It is not right, in my opinion, that such a measure should be referred to the Naval Committee. I believe it should be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MYERS and Mr. SWANSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from Montana surrendered the floor?

Mr. MYERS. I had not intended to do so. I wanted to make a few additional remarks, and I merely sat down to rest a little while the floor was being occupied in my time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds, I wish to propound a parliamentary question. I wish the Chair would state whether or not a mere motion to refer a bill or resolution to a committee is subject to unlimited debate during the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator that the Vice President, at the time of the commencement of the discussion with relation to this matter, made the following statement before he called the present occupant to the chair:

The Chair assumed a prerogative yesterday which the Chair did not possess. The motion is debatable, and Senators can take all day upon it, or until 2 o'clock.

Mr. McCUMBER. That means the debate is unlimited until 2 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under subdivision 3 of Rule XIV is the following:

No bill or joint resolution shall be committed or amended until it shall have been twice read, after which it may be referred to a committee; bills and joint resolutions introduced on leave, and bills and joint resolutions from the House of Representatives, shall be read once, and may be read twice, on the same day, if not objected to, for reference, but shall not be considered on that day as in Committee of the Whole, nor debated, except for reference, unless by unanimous consent.

The rule says "nor debated, except for reference"; and there is no limitation on that, it seems.

Mr. McCUMBER. The point I am trying to make, Mr. President, is that the general rule relative to debate not exceeding five minutes applies until 1 o'clock under our rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is under our Rule VIII, after the conclusion of the morning business.

Mr. SMOOT. And when the bill is on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; and when it is on the calendar.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, Mr. President, if this debate is to go on without limit, I shall insist upon the other rule, namely, that no Senator shall speak more than twice on the same day and upon the same subject.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from North Dakota gave notice that he would make a speech to-day, and if he prefers speaking now I will consent to this matter going over until to-morrow. I would not let this matter interfere with the speech he desires to make to-day; and if he wishes to speak now, with the consent of the other Senators, I will let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all right. That is satisfactory.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I think the point of order made by the Senator from North Dakota really was in substance that he desired to make a speech. I am perfectly willing to yield for that purpose and let the matter go over until to-morrow.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator gave notice that he desired to make a speech, and I would not interfere with it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, these notices have been given ever since I have been in the Senate, and I think very properly given, that those Senators who desire to absent themselves may have the opportunity, and others who have business and desire to attend to it may do so. I think the practice is very valuable for another reason—that we may know how to accommodate our business to the time that is at our disposal. While it is immaterial to me whether I go on now or an hour later, I understand that a great many Senators desire to attend the funeral this afternoon, and I should be gratified if I may be allowed to proceed at this time.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask that the motion go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the further consideration of this motion to refer will go over until to-morrow.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that the morning business has not been closed, and I do not wish to take the time of the Senate until it is closed.

PEACE BASES.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, on August 15, 1917, I submitted a resolution, which is on the Table Calendar, and known as Senate resolution 115. I ask that it be indefinitely postponed. The resolution is already covered in other matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois asks for the indefinite postponement of Senate resolution 115. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is postponed indefinitely.

STANDARDIZATION OF WAGES.

Mr. McCUMBER obtained the floor.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from North Dakota to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. On the 4th day of January I submitted a resolution, being Senate resolution 174, directing the Committee on Education and Labor to inquire into the subject of wages having to do directly or indirectly with Government work, etc. The resolution is on the table. I ask that it be taken from the table and now taken up for consideration.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I request the Senator from Utah to allow the resolution to remain on the table until to-morrow. When this resolution is taken up I desire to address some remarks to the Senate on the general subject of politics in the war and other cognate questions related more or less to the resolutions of investigation which have been showered on the Senate. I expect in the course of my remarks to make some pointed, but, I need hardly say, not offensive, remarks in which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] will be personally interested; and as he is not here to-day I should like to give notice of my purpose, expressing the hope that on to-morrow the Senator from Pennsylvania may find it convenient to honor me with his presence.

Mr. KING. I shall be very glad to accede to the request of the Senator from Missouri, and ask that the resolution lie on the table to be considered to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will lie on the table for the present.

TRAINED NURSES FOR ARMY.

Mr. TRAMMELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 185), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Military Affairs be, and it is hereby, directed to investigate and report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the available number of trained nurses for service with the United States Army; and whether or not this present available number will be adequate for the needs of the Army when increased by the anticipated future increments, taking into consideration the increased demand when the Army shall more largely engage in active conflict; and to investigate and report on the advisability of at once establishing training courses or schools for nurses for future service with the Army hospitals; and to investigate and report what, if any, provisions have been made to this end by the War Department.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL PAGES.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 184), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to employ three additional pages for the Senate Chamber at \$2.75 per day each for a period lasting until the end of the present session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, to be paid from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on the 12th instant, approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 106) extending until January 1, 1919, the effective date of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914.

THE SHIPPING SITUATION.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, yesterday I gave notice that I would to-day discuss the present shipping situation and other matters pertinent to the present condition of the war in Europe. I shall be careful not to give any facts that have not been already made absolutely public, but I shall attempt to present figures and statistics that I think will be interesting and useful to the Senate in the future consideration of the duties which we shall be called upon to perform.

Mr. President, as we stand at the threshold of a new year, ready to shoulder every burden which a battle-torn and distracted world has thrust upon us, no matter of merely domestic concern should be allowed to hold a position of precedence over our important war duties. The pending question should at all times be the question of war.

Actuated by this conviction, it is my purpose here and now to develop and place upon the records of this body such a definite picture of the actual war situation of to-day as will enable us to clearly see and fully comprehend the duties which we have undertaken and with the hope that so seeing and comprehending we shall make our performance square with our colossal task.

Mr. President, the year 1918 opens on a world shrouded in darkness, lighted only by the fires of death. But horrible as is this gloom, great beyond words of expression as are the sufferings and agonies of nations, they are insignificant as compared with the blacker shadow of an impending military autocracy which threatens to rivet its accursed manacles on a world made slave to the brutal lusts of the god of war. Might, armored with dishonor, sustained by intrigue and weaponed with every hell-devised instrumentality which an intellect trained only in the school of murder could conceive, rides in triumph over the weaker and unprepared nations of Europe.

It is most proper that we, whose resources alone can by any possibility shield the world from military slavery, that we who alone have the latent power to save those ideals toward which the whole human race with slow, plodding, and weary steps have labored for centuries, should awaken at the beginning of this new year to a full realization of the magnitude of the task which destiny has assigned to us; and, thus realizing, that we should make our New Year's resolution conform in spirit, intensity, and devotion to the full measure of our sacred obligation.

I am well aware, Mr. President, that there are those who labor under the mistaken theory that to take account of our own weakness in any line or to publicly admit the strength or advantage of the enemy discourages our own people and encourages our foes; and so they advocate a course of suppression. Possibly there are people who will be thus affected, but unless the American people have woefully deteriorated since our last real conflict they certainly can not be so classified. From a military standpoint we as a people may be slow, but we have never failed to measure up to our full capacity when we knew what we must do; and, Mr. President, the sooner we now know and the sooner we gird ourselves for the realities of this war the better it will be for the country.

The first step toward the goal of victory is to undeceive ourselves. Looking at our enemy through the reverse end of the telescope as we have been doing is worse than folly. It creates an unwarranted assurance and invites disaster. We have heretofore talked too much of our invincibility and have done too little to demonstrate it. We have overcultivated our conceit and undercultivated our striking strength. Some one has truly said that "conceit may puff a man up, but it can never prop him up." Shakespeare speaks of boasting as a "killing tongue, but a quiet sword." I commend those words of wisdom to a certain gentleman who some months ago sent out to the American people the picture of a mighty sea battle between our convoy ships and a squadron of submarines—a picture so gory in its colorings that the column of water shot a hundred feet skyward by a bursting shell was red with the blood of our enemies and the dark waves encarnined as though kissed by a crimson sunset. I need not commend them to that British admiral who, at the beginning of the war, declared that the German Navy and the German submarine would be forced like rats out of their holes. He has since learned his lesson; and

his country, with that stern silence which always presages real power, is now giving to the world the old traditional spirit of the days of Crecy, of Blenheim, of Trafalgar, of Waterloo, and of Balaklava. Bluster and decision never have reigned and never can reign joint sovereigns of the mental throne. If decision shall now govern, bluster must now abdicate. The great military leaders of the world were equally renowned for their modesty. Grant never boasted; Lincoln hated a braggart.

Mr. President, from the very beginning of this war the press of the country has underestimated the striking power of the central nations and overestimated the strength and resources of the entente powers. The press of the country has assumed, and the people have fallen into the trap, that the central nations were weaker in man power than the forces against them, and that when we entered into the contest our vast resources and weight of numbers would quickly decide the conflict. Of course, those who have taken the trouble to make careful and accurate comparisons have known better. We must now learn the lesson that boasting will not win this war. Collecting money by the billions and spending it in wildest extravagance will not win the war. I am not condemning a proper optimistic spirit on the part of the people. But optimism is a virtue only when harnessed with energy and guided by an intelligent purpose. A blind complacency that fails to recognize great danger is a vice little less than active criminality. The present situation demands action and quick action.

Mr. President, in order to fully understand just what we must meet in this war, I wish to survey briefly the present situation where the battle is raging. What is the relative strength of the countries engaged along that battle front? I get tired of hearing people say that Germany can not win with the world against her. Such statements show a dense ignorance of real proportions. The world is not against the central powers, and the greater part of the world can not even get within striking distance of her. Instead of the world being against Germany on the battle line, she and her allies are vastly superior in territory, in population, and in resources, while their geographical situation gives them a thousand advantages over their opponents. At the beginning of this year, 1918, this country should awaken to that truth.

Mr. President, as no statistical data can so impress the mind as a visual image of proportion, I have prepared a map showing the territory constituting the central powers, the territory actually occupied by these powers and furnishing them the substance which they do not themselves produce. [Indicating map on wall.] The heavy blue line encircles not only the central powers engaged in this war but also includes the conquered territory of opposing countries giving all of their substance to the support of those central powers.

I have not been able to carry the blue line over that portion of Asia which is now held by the Turks. We know that we would have to press that line eastward and southward through Mesopotamia and on to the British line, and the map is not large enough for that purpose. Here we have—

Germany proper, with an area in square miles of.....	208,780
Austria-Hungary, including Bosnia and Herzegovina.....	260,034
Bulgaria.....	43,000
Turkey.....	710,000

A total of..... 1,221,814

That comprises the original boundaries of the central powers. But in addition to this the central powers are in actual possession of and utilizing all the resources of—

Belgium, with an area in square miles of.....	11,302
Serbia.....	34,000
Roumania, about.....	39,000
Russian Poland and other Russian territory, now about.....	150,000
Northern France.....	7,595
Montenegro.....	5,330
Albania.....	7,800

Making a total enemy country in her possession, in square miles, of about..... 255,027

Or greater than the entire German Empire. This makes a grand total of territory furnishing its resources for the central powers of 1,476,841 square miles.

Against this mighty empire we have in Europe—

Great Britain, including Ireland, square miles.....	121,331
France.....	207,054
Italy.....	110,623

Or a total of..... 439,008

Deducting therefrom the square miles of France now held by Germany of 7,595, we have left a total of 431,413.

In actual territorial domain, therefore, the central powers exceed the entente powers by nearly 3 to 1 and in actual territory possessed by them, over which they are exercising complete sovereignty and which is furnishing them with all its valuable

resources, the central powers exceed the entente powers by more than 3½ to 1.

Not only this, Mr. President, but the territory occupied by the central powers in productivity and in all that sustains modern life and adds to effectiveness in war is enormously superior, acre for acre, to that of the entente powers. Bulgaria has always produced a surplus of agricultural products. Austria-Hungary has always produced more agricultural products than she has consumed.

These central countries are in possession of all the important oil fields, of all the important coal fields, of all the important iron fields of continental Europe. With intensified farming, supplemented by reasonable economy, this section of Europe is unquestionably self-supporting in food products. The coming spring will undoubtedly see the vast fields of Russia promising a bounteous harvest for the German armies and civilian population.

Is it not about time that we stop our talk about the collapse of the central powers for lack of food? The truth is the central powers are better supplied with food than any other European belligerent power. Great Britain is suffering far more than any other country, is complaining less, and, for the most part, fighting harder.

Passing from the subject of physical resources and territorial domain, I want Senators now to again approach the fighting line and take accurate measurement of the man power of each nation engaged in that conflict. Here we have—

Germany, with a population in round numbers of.....	70,000,000
Austria-Hungary.....	50,000,000
Bulgaria.....	5,000,000
Turkey.....	21,000,000

Or a total population of..... 146,000,000

Pitted against these we have—

Great Britain and Ireland, with a population of.....	45,000,000
France (about).....	40,000,000
Italy.....	35,000,000

Or a total of..... 120,000,000

I have not included Belgium because the number of Belgian soldiers is a negligible quantity.

If we go to the limit in man power, any first-class nation can put into the ranks one-sixth of its population. On this basis the central powers can put into the field, in round numbers, 24,350,000. The entente powers, at the same ratio, could put into the field 20,000,000. The entente would be outnumbered on the battle line 4,350,000. But you may suggest that I have not considered Canada, Australia, and what may be drawn from India. A very brief glance at the situation, however, will demonstrate that the number of soldiers drawn from these distant countries are more than balanced by the number of men that Great Britain must utilize in other avenues than along the battle front. Remember that Great Britain must furnish the sea service for all of her allies. She must divert a vast number of men who could otherwise be called to the front to man the ships necessary to furnish herself food and clothing and to carry food, clothing, ammunition, and soldiers to her allies. I do not know just how many able men would be required for the service, but probably not less than 500,000.

Great Britain must hold the naval mastery of the ocean, at least the surface of the ocean, and this, including trawlers, chasers, mine sweepers, and so forth, will take, we will say, 500,000 more. This would about equal all of the soldiery which Great Britain can draw from her over-seas domains and leave the proportionate man strength about the same as suggested.

It must also be remembered that Great Britain, in furnishing ammunition and guns and other equipment to her allies, must withdraw from her otherwise fighting forces a vast number of men to produce those things. It should further be remembered that the conscription has not been applied to Ireland.

So it is safe to say that the entente countries, after using all their man power, will necessarily be outnumbered on the field of battle by between four and five million.

Nor is this all. The central powers have the additional advantage of one solid contiguous territory, with both flanks of their battle line resting against inviolate neutral territory. She can not, therefore, be flanked. All the entente powers can hope for is to either protect their line of battle or hold it without advantage to either, and this seems the utmost that can be hoped for until the United States really gets into the conflict, if we ever do get in.

Again, the transportation facilities of the central powers are such as to enable them to throw a preponderating force against any point in a line in a few hours, while it would take days to move a like force from point to point by the entente powers.

And still again, not a foot of the territory of the great central powers has been devastated or is under enemy control. Their industries, untouched by the hand of devastation, and organized as those of no other country in the world, are sending their steady flow of equipment to maintain those vast armies. The entente powers have about reached their limit. It is up to us to supply the deficiency. To just balance the man power of the central nations, this country should send to the front, as I have declared, and I reiterate it again, this country should have at the front to-day at least 5,000,000 soldiers. To equal the geographical advantage of the central powers, this country should have on the battle field at least an additional million. To overcome the advantages of a mere defensive warfare, to be the aggressors—in other words, to force the central powers to retreat—we should furnish at least another million; and as a retreat would shorten the line of the central powers and bring them nearer the axis of the arc, closer to the source of supply, the number of the offensive should be correspondingly increased.

So, Mr. President, we should have in the field at this time at least 7,000,000 men. And that is assuming that the three powers, England, France, and Italy, will all remain in the field.

But, Mr. President, who can say with any degree of certainty that in another six months Italy will still be battling for this world cause? Encouraging as our smile of hope may be, the ugly fact stares us in the face that about 300,000 of that army have surrendered within the last two months. There may be causes for that surrender of which I am ignorant, and I shall not criticize, but I shall not fail to note, in view of the fact, that the surrender was without even a battle, without even a real blow; that there were strong indications of internal disintegration. There are possibilities, Mr. President, even more grave than this which I shall not mention at this time.

But with Italy out and with France flanked, though our burdens would be enormously increased, we would not be beaten in this war. Supply Great Britain with food and clothing and Great Britain and the United States can continue this war for 40 years if necessary. British soldiers and British sailors will fight to the death. In my judgment, they will suffer more and still maintain their tenacity of purpose than any other European people, but no amount of courage or fidelity can resist the weapon of famine. And talk as heroically and as optimistically as we may, the undeniable fact still stares at us that with her undersea craft Germany is taking in unchecked flow the very lifeblood of Great Britain in this unequal contest. Great Britain, the one country which is doing greater work and is suffering more than all others, whose financial credit and whose ships are sustaining the life of her allies, is rapidly losing that upon which her own life depends.

If Great Britain were to battle for herself alone, she might defend herself for years, even against this new monster of the sea. But she knows that she is fighting the world's war, that she is battling for a peace that shall be permanent; and she knows, as we all know, that any peace that will leave Continental Europe prostrate before any military autocracy means a renewed war or slavery, and she will never desert her allies, though, like Russia and Roumania, they fall one after the other, either through exhaustion or intrigue, or both, so long as one of them remains at her side.

In my opinion, there is but one power that can overcome her endurance, and that is the power of starvation—a starvation brought about by Germany's only hope, the submarine, which alone can paralyze her arm and destroy her power.

The question, then, presents itself to us. How long can she stand this strain? Russia and Roumania are out of the war. Italy is losing ground. France is unable to make any headway. The wall of opposition at the eastern end of the battle line in continental Europe is crumbling. How long can Italy withstand the Teutonic pressure? Optimistic, indeed, must be the man who would prophesy a single year without additional support. With Italy under the heel of the conqueror, with France assailed in the flank, who can prophesy that that country will not be quickly brought under the heel of the same conqueror, and England's Army left to battle against overwhelming numbers? You may say that this is painting a gloomy picture. This, Mr. President, is delineating two things, first, the exact situation as it now is, and, second, the possibilities of the future; and it is presented with the hope that we will at least partially awaken to a realization of what is before us.

In April of 1917, in an address before the Senate, I declared that this war would be lost or won by the U-boat; that if we were able to meet its ravages, we would win; if we were not able, we would lose. I have not changed in the slightest degree the opinion I then held. Every day has added to my conviction. Every day has seen fewer tons of the world's shipping afloat. Germany declared that if she could sink a million tons of the world's shipping a month she would bring England to her

knees in 10 months. Had she been able to do so her hope might possibly have been realized. She has not done all of that, but she has sunk about 8,000,000 tons of the world's shipping in the year 1917, and the destruction goes on without cessation and with little variation in the monthly toll.

The question is not whether these central powers can conquer the United States. Of course they can not conquer us. Our resources are so great and so diversified, our food, clothing, and mineral supplies are so adequate, that we could live in comfort for a century, even though we had not a merchant ship afloat on the ocean, and then we could do just what Germany is now doing to the British shipping—that is, without any shipping of our own to defend—we could turn into the ocean such a hoard of submarines as would close every German port to the outside world until she begged for peace.

I am not failing to observe the strain of this war on the central powers. But they are buoyed up with the courage that comes from the fact that the prowess of Russia has been broken; that Roumania has surrendered; that they have opened the granaries of Russia; and that their U-boats report in undiminished figures the weekly toll of enemy merchant ships.

The question is, Can our allies, and especially Great Britain, stay in the field until we can actually get into this war? Or will those powers be compelled to declare a draw, with nothing settled and begin the preparation for a further and greater slaughter?

And this, Mr. President, brings us right up to the one situation which is so imminent and which so overshadows all others that it is folly to talk about raising armies or saving food supplies until that question is solved, and that is the shipping question. Why talk about sending a million men to Europe when we have not the ships to take care of more than a quarter of a million? Why talk about conserving our food in order to assure a surplus for export when we have not the ships to take one-quarter of that surplus?

Mr. President, our allies informed us the very day of our entry into the struggle that what they most needed was ships; that ships were far more important to them than men; that they must have food and coal and ammunition; that Great Britain had turned over to France 2,000,000 tons of her shipping; that she was supplying her merchant marine to all the other allies, while suffering a devastation many times greater than all put together; that she was losing by the submarine from six to seven million tons per year, while her shipyards in 1916 produced but little over half a million gross tons. They cried for ships, they begged for ships, and more ships. They said to us, "Give us 6,000,000 tons in 1918 and we can possibly withstand the ravages of the submarine." We allayed their fears; we assured them we would supply that shipping. We took that duty upon ourselves, the most important, the most vital duty incumbent upon us in this war. And, Mr. President, we have neglected that duty beyond any other, shamefully neglected it. They tell us it was because of the wrangling and disagreements among the members of the Shipping Board. But had the members of the Shipping Board fully realized what the creation of this tonnage would mean in this war, had they contemplated the disastrous results that would follow their failure I can not believe that any one of them would have been so unpatriotic as to have delayed construction while they were fighting out differences of opinion. I must attribute the delay to a lack of appreciation of the magnitude of the submarine danger. It is between that and unpatriotism only that I must decide.

We appointed a Kilkenny Shipping Board and then we went to sleep, and as this board awakes to the chimes of the new year it says that it hopes to produce of new shipping 2,000,000 gross tons. Was ever a promise more glibly made? Was ever a promise more disgracefully broken?

As one modest Member of this body, I have not slept at my post or failed to hoist the danger signal. I admit that what I may have said upon the subject could not penetrate very far, and especially against the assurance of the Committee on Naval Affairs that there was really nothing serious in the submarine menace. I have tried in a most earnest, though apparently feeble way to awaken the country, the Navy Department, the Shipping Board, and the Committee on Naval Affairs to the dire situation that would certainly confront us unless we directed our energies toward meeting the submarine menace. In February, 1917, in April, in July, and again in August I attempted to present this matter. I prepared tables and statistics to bring the subject matter home to us. I introduced a bill which, had the Committee on Naval Affairs not been misled by the unfounded assurance of the Navy Department, would, in my opinion, have ships afloat to-day that could defy the torpedo. But the answer from this committee, given with smiling serenity, was that my fears were unfounded; that the Navy Department had had the matter under consideration; that it had conceived a plan which

would in a few weeks make the submarine menace a matter of no consequence.

I was assured that if I would see the Secretary of the Navy I would be relieved of all concern.

Well, Mr. President, I doubted if the Secretary of the Navy had in contemplation any real method of meeting that menace. So I introduced a resolution calling on him to give to the Senate, if not incompatible with national interests, what steps had been taken and what in view to meet this menace. The following excerpts from the letter of the Secretary of the Navy in response to this resolution are sufficient to demonstrate the spirit of incredulity on the part of the Navy Department in respect to the possibility of protecting merchant vessels against the submarine torpedo.

Contrary to the press reports, there is no single device which has solved the submarine menace; it is considered very unlikely that there ever will be any single device that can accomplish this desirable end. It is a well-known fact that for every offense there is a defense, and for every successful defense there will develop a new type of offense. It therefore appears essential to develop not only one but as many devices as may have sufficient merit to justify their use.

I heartily agree with the Secretary that for every offense there is a defense. But, Mr. President, what we complain of and what every nation whose sons are strangling down to watery graves every day and hour of the year have a right to complain of, is that the effort to find the real defense against the torpedo offense has been too insignificant in comparison with the gravity of that offense. Proposed measures of defense which give the greatest promise have been met with seeming hostility rather than with welcoming demeanor.

The answer proceeds:

The department has placed available for use such vessels as conditions warrant and needs justify for the purpose of conducting the necessary tests. Shore facilities have also been made available as necessary. The representatives of the various boards and councils mentioned above have utilized their own laboratories or laboratories placed at their disposal in order that no effort may be spared to produce the desired results.

Mr. President, it is the duty of the Navy Department on its own account and at its own expense to make reasonable tests. The Navy Department is one of the war arms of this Nation, and as such charged with the duty of developing a defense against this awful destruction of the merchant marine of the world upon which we and our allies must depend in this struggle; and having billions at its disposal for this purpose it has no right to say to the private individual, "We will give you shore facilities and the use of our laboratories. Now, you show us." The individual has not the means to build a ship or a quarter of a ship; you have, and it is up to you to give adequate tests to those proposals which, indorsed by experts on both explosives and ship construction, give fair promise of rendering the torpedo harmless. This war is costing \$160,000,000 daily, and you can well afford a little \$50,000, the sum asked to give the proposal a fair trial.

Again, says the Secretary:

Senate resolution No. 76 appears to apply primarily to mechanical devices to protect or shield merchant vessels, thereby covering only a limited part of the field. It is believed that the reports in the press of the country, referred to, must have originated with the various inventors, who naturally believe that their ideas are satisfactory.

While numerous inventions and mechanical contrivances for protecting and shielding merchant vessels have been submitted to and considered by the department, none of them are regarded as perfected in the sense of being an adequate and satisfactory contrivance for the purpose and capable of general application to merchant vessels engaged in traffic between ports of the United States and ports of Europe.

The attitude of this department seems to be that if some kindly disposed citizen will beg or borrow enough to demonstrate beyond any possibility of failure and perfect a vessel that can withstand a torpedo attack and still keep afloat, the department will not be averse to giving the matter consideration.

Mr. President, that is not the spirit that should dominate this department in this dire emergency. Its negative attitude should immediately give way to an aggressive attitude. It should not only welcome but search with unswerving energy for any clue or means that would promise a solution of this great and controlling factor of this war.

Mr. President, after repeated efforts to secure information from the Navy Department or the Shipping Board concerning any real program for ship construction and meeting the same spirit of indifference on the part of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I sought to awaken the Senate to the gravity of the situation by a presentation of such statistics as I could then gather covering the destruction of the tonnage of the world, the constructive possibilities of the maritime nations engaged to meet such destruction, and the resulting devastation which, if not met, would spell the doom of those nations which were bearing the whole burden of an unequal war. I then declared as a sequence to that argument that unless we could meet the ravages of the submarine it would destroy our allies before we could get into the conflict. Since then Russia and Roumania

have been overcome by force and intrigue. Italy has been rapidly surrendering men and territory. Serbia is prostrate. The power of France has subsided to a defensive attitude only. Britain alone is striking hard and battling to the death, while Fate, with measuring line, is telling off her losses in ships on which the life of her population depends. She dare not even look at the full ugliness of the situation. Her sons in grim desperation fight and die or, with the gloom of the fatalist on their brows, go down to death unable to strike or even see their foes.

We are raising an army of a million men, which we hope to make effective some time. We must convoy them by long, circuitous and zigzag routes, requiring 40 per cent more tonnage than a direct route would demand.

We know we must supply Great Britain and France and Italy. We know we shall require 5,000,000 men in France before we can ever hope to equalize the forces of the powers pitted against each other. Where is our shipping? Where is it coming from? Possibly God knows; certainly neither the Shipping Board nor the Navy Department knows.

What, then, is the real shipping situation of to-day? It is an ugly picture, I admit, but we must look it squarely in the face, and once recognizing its proportions, we shall cease to think or talk about setting afloat a little two or three million tons of shipping in 1918, but, in conjunction with our allies, bend every energy toward the construction of ten times that tonnage.

To properly supply our wants we and our allies would have use for more shipping than the entire world possessed on August 4, 1914. But of course we can not dream of such a realization.

In giving the data which I shall now present, I must follow consistently a single standard for measuring the tonnage capacity of any vessel. When we read of the destruction of a ship of 4,000 tons, we never know with certainty whether the reporter means net tonnage, gross tonnage, or dead-weight tonnage. To make this clear let me define each:

"Dead-weight tonnage" means the maximum of cargo, bunkers, consumable stores, engines, boilers, and all other matter, including passengers and crew.

"Gross tonnage" means the number of units of 100 cubic feet each of the entire cubical capacity of the vessel, including spaces occupied by cabins, boilers, engines, coal bunkers, and so forth.

"Net tonnage" means gross tonnage less the space occupied by all cabins, boilers, engines, coal bunkers, and so forth, and is a trifle over three-fifths of gross tonnage.

When Great Britain speaks of a vessel of a certain tonnage she means gross tonnage. When the United States speaks of producing a certain tonnage of vessels during the war she means dead-weight tonnage.

To reduce dead-weight tonnage to gross tonnage, the term generally used by maritime nations, we must divide dead-weight tonnage by 1.65. Thus 4,000 dead-weight would be only about 2,425 gross tonnage. The data I shall give will be in gross tonnage only.

The Journal of Commerce gives the total tonnage of the world on August 1, 1914, as 48,139,365.

Others give it as high as 51,000,000.

I think we may properly adopt as a fair basis for our computation 49,000,000.

In order to ascertain what tonnage is now afloat we must first deduct from this the tonnage of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey, which in the early stages of the war was either destroyed or driven off the seas and which amounted to about 7,000,000 tons.

This would leave for our allies and all neutrals about 42,000,000 tons.

Destruction since the war began and up to January 1, 1918, will be, by submarine and mine, about 9,500,000 tons; other maritime casualties about 1,275,000 tons; total casualties, 10,775,000 tons; leaving a balance of prewar tonnage still afloat, 31,225,000 tons.

There has been added to this tonnage, constructed since the beginning of the war, by—

	Tons.	Tons.
Great Britain in 1915-----	668,000	
Great Britain, 1916-----	538,000	
Great Britain, 1917, estimated-----	1,400,000	
Total by Great Britain-----		2,606,000
United States, 1915, ocean-going (we have created something more than this, but I must limit the figures to the ocean-going tonnage)-----	141,864	
United States, 1916, ocean-going-----	237,836	
United States, 1917, ocean-going, about-----	1,000,000	
Total by United States-----		1,479,700
All other construction-----		500,000
Total construction allied and neutral shipping-----		4,585,700
Total construction afloat January 1, 1918, 35,810,700 tons.		

The shipping of all the countries, exclusive of the central powers and Turkey, at the beginning of the war was 42,000,000 tons.

Therefore the shipping of our allies, ourselves, and the neutral countries has decreased since 1914 about 6,189,300 tons.

As we can only call upon our own shipping in case of an emergency—and I mean our shipping and our allies' shipping—it may be well to consider the shipping of those countries engaged in war against the central powers independently of other world shipping.

The tonnage of Great Britain at the beginning of the war is given as 19,779,119; say, in round numbers, 20,000,000; France, 2,300,000; Italy, 1,700,000; the United States, 8,000,000; total, 32,000,000 tons.

I have not included Japan, for the reason that she is in this war only in Asia and is using very few ships within the war zone.

The losses of these countries since the war began have been about 9,500,000 tons.

Balance of prewar shipping, 22,500,000 tons; constructed and put afloat by the United States and Great Britain, including all vessels commandeered which are ocean going, about 2,400,000 tons; amount now afloat, 24,900,000 tons.

Loss of the allies, including the United States, since 1914, after making all allowance for new construction, about 7,100,000 tons.

Thus, when we are in need of an enormous increase in shipping facilities to carry on this war we find ourselves at the beginning of 1918 with 7,100,000 tons less than we had in 1914.

But, Mr. President, this comparison does not measure the full deficiency. To keep apace with the growing population and commerce in peace times demands an increased tonnage of about 5 per cent annually. To meet peace requirements these countries should have had, therefore, at the beginning of 1918, 38,400,000 tons.

So, Mr. President, if we had no war on our hands to-day, we and our allies would be short of our combined needs in times of peace 13,500,000 tons.

But, Mr. President, these calculations would be more valuable if we could narrow them down to the available trans-Atlantic tonnage. That is the principal thing. The present emergency calls for ships to be used exclusively between the United States and Canada and Argentina on one side and Europe on the other. In talking of total world tonnage we are liable to deceive ourselves, as this tonnage consists of all kinds of boats and sailing vessels and ships that can not be used for ocean traffic. For instance, while in 1914 the entire tonnage of the United States was about 8,000,000, less than 2,000,000 was engaged in foreign commerce. The lakes, rivers, and coastwise commerce account for most of that tonnage. So, too, less than one-fourth of the tonnage of the world was engaged in trans-Atlantic service prior to the war. And when we recall that nearly all the U-boat victims have been trans-Atlantic ships we begin to realize the tremendous blow at the commerce upon which we must now depend.

On July 23, 1917, the Emergency Fleet Corporation prepared a chart showing that out of the total trans-Atlantic shipping of 10,000,000 tons, the submarine destruction was accounting for 7,500,000 tons per annum, leaving only 2,500,000 of the original tonnage.

This mighty loss has to be made good by diverting all possible tonnage from other routes and by new construction. But, Mr. President, the sources of supply are grossly inadequate to fill the gap.

So, in a nutshell, the situation to-day calls for us in men 5,000,000. To supply these men constantly employed an additional tonnage of 30,000,000 is required; and if we are to keep the commerce of ourselves and our allies up to a normal condition we should require a further construction of 13,500,000; in all, 43,500,000.

We should need that much additional tonnage to be able to throw the maximum strength of our allies and even half of our own maximum strength into this war.

But, coming right down to the unquestionable necessities of the shipping tragedy: We have in Europe to-day, say, 200,000 soldiers. I have shown that before we can make any real headway, before our allies can make any real advance against the increasing numbers of the central powers transported to the western front since the surrender of Russia, we should have not less than 5,000,000 soldiers in France. We should have ships enough to supply those soldiers and keep them supplied with ammunition. Considering the longer passage, the longer period of time consumed in such passage, from the best information I can obtain I am of the opinion that it will require not less than 6 tons per man to transfer these men and equipment of all char-

acter, and thereafter to supply losses and keep the number up to that standard it will continually require 6 tons per soldier. That would mean that there must be diverted for Army purposes alone to supply an army of 5,000,000 men 30,000,000 tons. As heretofore shown, we and our allies are now short of normal needs by 13,500,000 tons.

Recognizing the impossibility of our being able to produce the tonnage we should have, we must direct our attention to the minimum amount that we must produce if we have any hope of maintaining the status quo on the firing line until we can get into the war. That minimum amount is problematical, because we do not know how tenaciously the Italian forces may hold out. It is asserted that Italy to sustain her fighting power will need 250,000 tons of wheat each month until the next harvest, besides vast quantities of coal. France is short and is sounding the alarm, and Great Britain is short and must again cut her rations.

Great Britain advised us at the time we entered this conflict that the allies, to maintain their present striking force, must have from this country at the very least 6,000,000 tons of shipping. We must remember that Great Britain has loaned much of her available tonnage to her allies. France, for instance, has 2,000,000 tons of British shipping under her control. In addition to this, Great Britain is supplying the major part of the shipping for all of her allies' requirements.

It is a fair estimate to say that the British and other allies' losses for the year 1917 from all causes was about 8,000,000 tons.

Estimating the losses for 1918 on the basis of the last nine months, which excludes the very heaviest sinkings in the winter of 1917, it is safe to predict that the allies will lose in 1918 at least 7,500,000 tons.

Great Britain can produce in 1918 hardly more than 2,000,000 tons.

That would leave for us to construct to keep even the present tonnage afloat 5,500,000 tons.

But the amount afloat at the present time is not sufficient to take care of the pressing needs of Italy and France, even leaving Great Britain out of the question. There should be at least another five or six million tons for that purpose; in all, say, 11,000,000 tons.

If we attempt to put 1,000,000 men in the field in 1918 it would require 6,000,000 tons additional, or a grand total of 17,000,000 tons.

So, to put ourselves and our allies on a proper war footing, we and they combined should produce 43,500,000 tons of shipping before 1919. To meet the pressing demands and keep the situation in balance, without further loss of territory and possible loss of some of our allies, we must construct in 1918 17,000,000 tons. Can it be done?

Mr. President, it can be done, and I shall proceed to show how it can be done. I do not expect to make any impression upon the departments responsible for the conduct of the war, any more than I was able to make an impression last April when I declared that the question of winning or losing this war was simply a question of overcoming or being overcome by the U boat. I know the awakening process must be through the medium of the press and public opinion, and I must do my bit in this war by helping this process. Heretofore arguments seemed to have been futile. You might as well have tried to persuade a turtle on a railroad track that his inactivity meant destruction. He would have simply drawn his head within his shell with the same optimistic assurance that has characterized our course in reference to this whole submarine menace. Had the Navy Department of the United States been able to get out of its shell of antiquated ideas long enough to have caught a ray of the inspiration of originality, I believe we could already have seen the doom of the U boat. Had the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate been an active power to win the war rather than a passive instrumentality to simply advise and report what the Navy Department in its wisdom or unwisdom had seen fit to suggest, we should have had to-day ships that would have been able to defy the submarine torpedo. But so ossified had become this great department, so conceited in the prowess of dreadnaughts, that it condemned without hearing and as a gross impertinence any suggestion that a ship could be so constructed as to continue afloat after being struck by a torpedo. And while that august department has been literally throwing away millions its auxiliary, the Shipping Board, refused the little sum of \$50,000 asked for by the greatest expert on explosives in the United States to test a torpedo-proof hull, and who, with a ship contractor, presented plans and specifications of a ship which he declared would carry its freight across the ocean with the loss of only about 11 per cent of cargo space, submarine or no submarine.

Mr. President, even though the ship, constructed as proposed, should not have proved a success \$50,000 would have

demonstrated it; and, in view of the mighty promise that, if successful, it would be equivalent to the instantaneous destruction of every U boat afloat and would render harmless every one under construction, assuring victory before the end of another year, was it not worth the trial?

We have prided ourselves upon being the greatest inventive country in the world, and, outside of the deep-rutted and case-hardened Military and Naval Departments, our pride is fully justified. Our opportunities for the utilization of new mechanical inventions have intensified and strengthened the inventive genius of the American people. The greatest instrumentalities of destruction and usefulness in the war to-day are all of American origin. The submarine, the flying machine, the caterpillar truck, the Maxim gun, and many others which might be mentioned, all had their origin in the United States; and, strange to say, every one of them has been tabooed by our War and Navy establishments. And yet this war has demonstrated that it must be fought with new weapons, and the new weapons must be neutralized by new instrumentalities. The whole success of Germany has been due to the fact that, though not the inventor, she has been the leader in the utilization of these new devices. Long before the war began her scientists were developing gases to blind the eyes or burn out the lungs of her opponents, flames to burn away all obstacles to their massed attacks, U boats to strike unseen.

Germany was not afraid to try out any new and original idea. It may be that the Zeppelins have not proved a success, but she had the courage to try them and to try them thoroughly. And she has undoubtedly tried many other things that have not been successful, but out of the many she has brought forth new instrumentalities of destruction that are fast leading her to victory, while our Navy Department and our Shipping Board strain at the little expense of \$50,000 to try out the most important suggestion that has ever been made in this war. The department must answer to the indictment of inability to meet a situation. The only answer to that indictment is one either of incompetency or of negligence, and neither is satisfactory. Had this department been competent it must have known long before we entered into this war just what the controlling factor in the conflict would be, namely, the question of meeting the submarine ravages. It knew that little, if anything, could be hoped for in capturing and destroying the submarine. It knew that hunting submarines would be as uncertain as hunting needles in a haystack. And yet almost nothing has been done to meet that situation. In fact, nothing has been suggested by the department other than to build ships as rapidly as the U-boats could sink them. In other words, it proposed to ram ships and cargoes and men down the monster's throat in such numbers as to choke it to death. The only thing that has appealed to this department or the Shipping Board as a defense against the submarine has been the great idea of painting a ship to look like the ocean waves.

Mr. President, the very first step taken in 1918 should be to cease for the present the sending of our soldiers over to Europe and to use every ton of shipping space for food for our allies. The empty caisson can wait, the empty stomach can not wait. The soldier must eat before he can shoot, and if he waits overlong for his food he can never shoot again. Just now our allies need our food a thousand times more than they need our soldiers. The splendid words of our President restating our war aims can not but fill the hearts of all our allies with new courage. I would supplement that with a thousand cargoes of food that this courage may have a foundation to stand on, and the tide of military success will immediately be turned in our favor.

Concurrent with this effort should be steps to immediately demonstrate whether it is possible to construct a vessel that will keep afloat notwithstanding torpedo attack, and if demonstrated then every ship should be so constructed. Germany's entire reliance is in her submarine. Pull the teeth of this monster of the sea and she will make the peace we demand in a month. Building ships and loading them with munitions for torpedo fodder must certainly be most gratifying to Germany herself. One ship that will stay afloat is worth a thousand ships at the bottom of the ocean. If the torpedo is rendered harmless every submarine is thereby instantly destroyed at a single blow. The assurance that such a ship can be constructed, coming from the source it does, demands an immediate test, and the gravity of the situation emphasizes the demand a thousandfold.

The next step is to make a full and adequate test of reinforced concrete ships. I understand that the Government has contracted for one or two of these ships. But what should be done is to put one of them to an immediate test. I do not think we should even make construction wait for that test. I believe that ships of this character have already been tried out in sufficient numbers to demonstrate their utility. As most of the ships proposed to be built are of slow speed, which will require convoy,

and as the ability of these concrete ships to stand the stress of ocean storms has already been demonstrated, the pressing exigencies of the shipping situation justify our proceeding immediately to construct a vast fleet of them. If, in the meantime, we find that the one constructed is not a success and can not be made a success we can cease our further efforts along that line. We can afford the loss far better than we can afford the delay. We can proceed with the construction of concrete ships without interfering with the construction of steel and wooden ships. The hulls can be constructed by unskilled labor, which is not the case in the construction of any other character of ship. Concrete can be produced in adequate quantities at any point desired. I have been informed by a single firm of long experience in concrete structures that it can turn out 10,000,000 tons of hulls in 1918. This could easily be increased to 20,000,000. Notwithstanding the fabulous prices paid to all character of skilled workmen, we would have no difficulty in securing the unskilled labor necessary for the construction of this reinforced concrete tonnage.

Mr. President, there appeared in the December number of the North American Review an article written by Col. Harvey, entitled "Are we losing this war?" I shall not comment on the article, which, while it may have had some justification for the ironical criticisms, did not point out any specific line which should be followed to win the war.

The question weighing most heavily on every man who attempts to analyze the actual war situation as we enter the year 1918 is not are we losing the war, but are we liable to lose the kind of a peace proclaimed by the President in his address on the 8th day of January, 1918? Have we been so remiss, so slow in preparing to meet the great emergency that confronted us when we drew the sword that we shall be unable to secure that kind of peace that will assure to all nations immunity from destruction by powerful military neighbors and an opportunity to work out their own industrial and commercial destinies unscared by the specter of military destruction?

I have an abiding hope, based upon the everlasting principle that right will in the end prevail, that we shall not emerge from this war without securing this peace; but I am equally certain that unless we shall come to the support of our allies with shipping facilities many times greater than we propose some of our allies will fall before we can take their place on the battle field and thereby prolong this war, with its hideous slaughter, for many months. Our every thought, our every energy should now be devoted exclusively to these methods of meeting the submarine ravages, to the question of supporting our allies with food and such war material as they can not produce, until the full might and prowess of this country, with the invincible sweep of our armies, shall achieve a victory that will forever free the nations of the world from the tyranny of autocratic militarism and its people from the crushing load of armaments.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 17, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 16, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, increase our confidence and faith in Thee as individuals and as a people; that amid all the changes, disappointments, and sorrows of life we may have that peace which the world can neither give nor take away.

"For they that trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion, which can not be removed, but abideth for ever."

Thus may we be firm in the Lord and increase in all that makes a Nation great; for Thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory, forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON WATER POWER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the following Committee on Water Power, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SIMS, Mr. FERRIS, Mr. LEVER, Mr. DOREMUS, Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Mr. LEE of Georgia, Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska, Mr. RAKER, Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, Mr. PARKER of New Jersey, and Mr. ANDERSON.

The SPEAKER. The committee is made up by taking the six top members of the three committees who were invited to the White House.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Maj. Augustus Peabody Gardner, formerly a Member of this Congress and who resigned therefrom to enter the military service of the United States, and whose death occurred at Camp Wheeler, Ga., on Monday, the 14th day of January, 1918.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

SENATE BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3235. An act amending section 32, Federal farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916.

INSURANCE AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT, ETC.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The unfinished business is House joint resolution 189, to provide for a commission to inquire into the advisability of establishing national insurance against unemployment, invalidity, and sickness. The resolution is on the Union Calendar. The House will automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House joint resolution 189, with Mr. RUBEY in the chair.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned on Wednesday last we had concluded the general debate on the resolution. I therefore ask for the reading of the resolution for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That a commission is hereby created and established, to be known as the Commission on Social Insurance, hereinafter referred to as the commission. The commission shall be composed of five persons, to be appointed by the President of the United States, two of whom shall be employers of labor and two of whom shall be representatives of organized labor, the Secretary of Labor to be the fifth member of the commission and the chairman thereof. It shall be within the power of the Secretary of Labor to select a representative of the Department of Labor to act in his stead in any hearing or investigation in which the Secretary himself may be unable to participate, and said representative shall have full power to act in the name of the Secretary of Labor, but the position of the Secretary of Labor, as the fifth member and as chairman of the commission, shall in no wise be impaired, and in the report, findings, and recommendations of the commission his name and title shall be appended.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "That," in line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "When the present war emergency shall have ended, as evidenced by a proclamation of the President to that effect."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of perfecting this resolution.

With the object of affording all proper legislative relief to men and women who labor I am in the heartiest accord, and I believe the great question of the future to be the proper assembly, distribution, and care of labor, in order that the laboring people and the country in which they labor and its people generally may be mutually benefited.

One does not labor for himself alone. He labors for society, and society should recognize its responsibility to the laborer. So the questions of proper surroundings in labor, of proper safeguards against injury, the care and compensation for the disabled, the invalided, and the aged are very vital questions.

But just at this time there could be no reliable data collected on these great questions which are not already in print or in the possession of the committee bringing out this bill.

Data to be useful must be live data, and obsolete data are worse than useless—they are cumbersome and obstructive of the search for truth.

At present all labor in the United States should be united in one great purpose, and that purpose is the doing of the appointed task allotted to each and in which he is most capable of achievement for the winning of the war.

Labor is loyal, and with loyal labor the complete success of American arms is assured.

At the present time I do not think there is any such proportion of involuntary employment as will lead to any information of value being acquired by any commission or investigating body.

If we concede, as we must, that there will be a great number of labor problems resulting from the war, that the questions of readjustment and reapportionment of labor are vital ones, as well as the questions of disability and invalidity and other elements which enter into the employment of labor, still present industrial conditions in America, when all this country is speeding up for the purpose of winning the war, are not the normal conditions of America, and the information which will be of benefit to the laboring man and woman will be information relative to normal conditions as they will exist after this great and war emergency has passed?

Therefore I offer this amendment, that there be no creation of this proposed committee until the present war emergency shall be ended.

I attach, with the consent of the committee, a newspaper clipping reciting a called meeting to be held at the University of Illinois in February of this year for the purpose of discussing the questions of labor problems resulting from the war:

LABOR PROBLEMS GROWING OUT OF WAR TO BE CONSIDERED BY EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES.

URBANA, ILL., January 13.

Employers and employees are to be brought together in a discussion of "Labor problems resulting from the war" at a congress to be held at the University of Illinois in February. The university, acting in conjunction with the Illinois Manufacturing Association, the Illinois Coal Operators' Association, the National Safety Council, the State Federation of Labor, and many other associations of employers and employees of the State, is holding the congress.

Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor; Charles Piez, of the United States Shipping Board; Victor Olander, secretary of the Illinois State Federation of Labor; and R. C. Richards, chairman of the central safety committee of the Northwestern Railroad, are among many prominent speakers who have been asked to participate in the congress and lead the discussion of the many relating problems.

The congress has been called for the purpose of impressing upon both labor and capital the need of recognizing the human element in production, especially at this time. It is hoped that greater cooperation between employers and wage earners in this State will result, and so further the production for the country, at least during the war.

The congress was made possible by the efforts of several prominent Illinois faculty men, who persuaded the university to invite representatives of employers and employees to Champaign to discuss labor problems, particularly from the standpoint of the effect of the war on them.

Questions concerning the health of the worker, the many injuries which he is subject to at his work, the difficulties of laborers in finding work and of employers in hiring men, and problems of scientific management will be among the topics to be considered. The congress will be held February 14, lasting through February 16.

Mr. KEATING and Mr. McCORMICK rose.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to support the amendment?

Mr. McCORMICK. No; I desire to oppose it.

Mr. KEATING. Then I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment on the ground that now is the time to begin the accumulation of preliminary information. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] had offered an amendment to postpone the report of the commission until after the war or for a given time after the conclusion of the war, I should have been disposed to have listened to his argument with a good deal of readiness. When all the world is making ready to cope with the problems which must arise from this conflict, to plan for the inevitable readjustment, greater by far than any of us can picture to ourselves, I say, Mr. Chairman, that it would be a grave error to postpone the appointment of such a commission. I shall have amendments to offer to the joint resolution, but to this amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio I for one am absolutely opposed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I question whether this report would be of much value if, as the joint resolution states, the commission is to make its report on December 1, 1918. We all know that industrial and sociological conditions will be radically changed in this country after the return of peace and that there will be some urgent need then to have a report of a commission, as this joint resolution provides, under conditions then existing, rather than under conditions that now exist in this country, which are abnormal and are largely resultant from this war. I recognize the need of having a commission to examine into conditions that will exist after the conclusion of the war, but to create a commission and allow them to go traveling over the world, as this joint resolution provides, during these war times, when everyone knows that this war is going to change completely the sociological conditions of and the obligations of government itself, those who survive from the battle field, as well as those who do not partake but remain

in the industrial walks of life, after peace is concluded would make their report of little value. I think the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio is a most meritorious one. This work will be of little value if it is going to proceed at the present time. We have had commissions in time of peace, commissions, for instance, on immigration, that have traveled the world over and collected voluminous information, but what value will the findings be of these traveling experts on conditions of to-day, which everyone recognizes will not be normal after the conclusion of the war?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Labor has carefully considered this feature of its report and believes this commission can carry on its work at this time. The argument that the commission will run all over the world in an effort to secure data is not worthy of very serious consideration. The men who will be named on this commission by the President of the United States will undoubtedly be gentlemen of distinction and you will not find them entering the war zone at this time except with the consent of the State Department. So I think we may very well leave the question of their movements to the members of the commission. The committee hopes this amendment will be voted down. I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I should favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], though I would very much rather favor a motion to strike out the enacting clause. I want to talk very seriously to the House for a very few moments because we are facing now a situation we have to meet. There is pending before the Committee on Appropriations deficiency estimates for about a billion and a half dollars and those on the way to the Congress will probably carry that total a couple of millions beyond. Some of these estimates are for matters of first importance; some of them represent the desire of some branches of the Government to use the war as an excuse for expanding its activities and increasing its appropriations.

This country has to-day a surfeit of commissions. We have had commissions about everything under the sun, commissions to reform every institution except our own, where the most reformation could take place. Echoes of the commission on social unrest have not died out before we are met with a proposition to create another commission to report on the subject of old-age pensions and insurance. The speeches of the gentlemen who support this matter, as well as the report which they submit to the House, tell you that there is already a great volume of valuable, accurate information upon the subject. There is no reason in the world why a committee willing to work should not itself gather whatever information is necessary to enable the House and the Congress to legislate upon this subject. I would infinitely rather have the result of its findings than the result of a commission that will be created as this one is proposed to be. We all know something about commissions.

This commission on the causes for social unrest, which, by the way, more than covers the field of reasons for nonemployment or unemployment, went over this country exploiting all sorts of views, from reactionary to what was almost anarchistic. It became a medium for exploiting the political ambitions of at least one of its members, and it would be running yet if Congress had not very wisely put a limit to its activities.

Now we are faced with a proposition to create a new commission. I do not speak against the commission because of an opposition to old-age pensions. I speak against the doing of a useless thing. Those men who favor legislation of this kind will better enhance it by having a committee of Congress deal with it than by having a commission to make a report on it. A commission that would report within a year from now would necessarily make a report that would be bound to be a wrong one, because it would be made as the result of a survey of conditions that are temporary and transitory and could not be the conditions upon which permanent, remedial legislation ought to be based. That must be appreciated by every man of judgment and of sense. Let it not be carried because it is in the interest of labor when the judgment of men is against it. Let no man vote against it because it is for labor, but let no man vote for it simply because it is for labor. Let it stand as any other proposal for a new commission would stand, and I am willing to submit then to the judgment of men.

And let me say one word more. If there ever was a time when the people of America are going to respect and reward courage on the part of public officials it is now. We are not going to be true to our trust if we appropriate moneys without any regard to results. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] fails to grasp the significance of the suggestion that we are now, when we

have no unemployment, to prepare for the emergency, to prepare for the change, for the disarrangement, for the dislocation in industry, which will be inevitable with the termination of the war.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield? Will this help to win the war?

Mr. LONDON. Well, I assume that every man and every woman in the United States will do everything to help the United States in the present crisis. The commission has its specific purpose, and that specific purpose is to prepare and to systematize information, to assemble data, which will be helpful to us in those days when it will be necessary to legislate on these problems. It is not a new thing that we are suggesting now. If the gentleman would examine the record of the appropriation bills during Taft's administration he would find that an appropriation bill carried an item for the holding of a congress at which this very question was to be discussed.

And may I say to the House this? That labor throughout the world realizes that now is the time to begin studying this problem. We do not have to wait for unemployment; we do not have to wait for the crisis when the soup kitchen will be suggested as a remedy; we do not have to wait for starvation and distress. A committee of Congress might be an excellent thing, but the suggestion before you is not that. The proposition before you is this: Shall we advance the study of a subject by nominating or appointing a commission, or shall we have no commission at all? Shall we delay until after the war, or shall we begin now to study, investigate, and scrutinize, and look into all the data available for the formation of an intelligent opinion on the subject? See what British labor says now in time of war on this subject:

Moreover, it can not but be anticipated that in all countries the dislocation of industry attendant on peace, the instant discharge of millions of munition workers and workers in war trades, and the demobilization of soldiers—in face of the scarcity of industrial capital, the shortage of raw materials, and the insecurity of commercial enterprise—will, unless prompt and energetic action be taken by the several Governments, plunge a large part of the wage-earning population into all the miseries of unemployment more or less prolonged.

In view of the fact that widespread unemployment in any country, like a famine, is an injury not to that country alone, but impoverishes also the rest of the world, the British labor movement holds that it is the duty of every Government to take immediate action, not merely to relieve the unemployed when unemployment has set in, but actually, so far as may be practicable, to prevent the occurrence of unemployment.

It therefore urges upon the labor parties of every country the necessity of pressing upon their Governments the preparations for plans for the execution of all the innumerable public works (such as the making and repairing of roads and railways, the erection of schools and public buildings, the provision of working-class dwellings, and the reclamation and afforestation of land) that will be required in the near future, not for the sake of finding measures of relief for the unemployed, but with a view to those works being undertaken at such a rate in each locality as will suffice, together with the various capitalist undertakings that may be in progress, to maintain at a fairly uniform level year by year, and throughout each year, the aggregate demand for labor, and thus prevent their being unemployed. It is now known that in this way it is quite possible for any Government to prevent, if it chooses, the very occurrence of any widespread or prolonged involuntary unemployment which, if it is now in any country allowed to occur, is as much the result of Government neglect as is any other epidemic disease.

This bill does not contemplate a system of payments to men who happen to be unemployed, whether they desire to work or not. We are primarily interested in the question of the preventive remedy, how to prevent unemployment, what to do in order that unemployment may not be upon us. It is not a commission to promote unrest. On the contrary, it is a commission to make unrest unnecessary; and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that Members should not hesitate to vote for the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate has been exhausted on the resolution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the vote be now taken.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the request for unanimous consent that all debate be now closed?

Mr. KEATING. Yes. I ask that all debate be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that all debate be now closed. Is there objection?

Mr. RAINY. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado moves that all debate on the pending amendment be now closed. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. KEATING. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 22, noes 48.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we have all gone crazy, but it seems that some of us are pursuing a very headlong course with regard to the money of the people of the United States. We are going deeper and deeper into the pockets of the people every session of Congress and with almost every bill that comes into this House, and we are doing much of it under cover of war; much of it because the country is in a state of excitement; much of it because it may be politically expedient to pass some of these extravagant measures.

I am glad the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, had his nerve with him this morning and saw his patriotic duty with respect to measures of this kind. The gentleman belongs to the majority party, although there may be members of the minority who may not agree with him. But he had the courage of his convictions this morning, and he spoke out the truth, that we are going far afield in the matter of expenditures, that we are taking great liberties with the money of the common people of the United States in order to promote schemes of one kind and another.

If anyone wants any information in regard to social insurance, all he has to do is to go down to the Department of Labor and pick out any one of hundreds of volumes on social questions that have already been prepared at the expense of the people and which nobody is reading.

Some time ago somebody wanted to know something about immigration, and we appointed a committee which expended nearly a million dollars to acquire information about immigration. That commission toured the world, just as this commission on social insurance will have power and money to do. It published many volumes that are now covered with dust.

Then, again, somebody wanted to know something about our industrial relations. So we created a Commission on Industrial Relations, and that commission toured the country and obtained enough information to satisfy a thousand Congresses, although this Congress probably never read a volume of the proceedings. Yet it published dozens of volumes, and came back session after session to obtain more money in order that it might keep up the agitation throughout the United States as between employer and employee. Now, do we want to get the employer and employee together, or do we want to set them further apart? What is the purpose of this new commission?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I regret I have not the time. I would like to yield, but I am within a minute of the end of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This new commission will have the power and the money to tour the country and invite the representatives of various lines of thought, various theories, and various schemes to come before it, and it will exploit itself and have columns in the newspapers showing unrest, even in time of war. It will stir up trouble to plague Congress, but it will not succeed in settling these social problems. It will come back to ask for more money and still more money, and this first \$50,000 will grow into a million dollars before it is done. It will give a number of gentlemen comfortable berths at public expense and an opportunity to make trouble. They may impede railroad progress and go into establishments manufacturing munitions for war and halt the proceedings while they air differences between those who are employing and those who are employed.

I think the time has come to put a quietus upon some of these commissions. I believe, with the gentleman from Kentucky, that this Congress is able to determine these questions for itself. I believe that the various committees of this Congress are as capable as any commission could possibly be to send for witnesses, to send for employees and employers, and to send for books and papers and obtain this information, if they desire it, at first hand. The idea here is that we shall constitute an autocratic body to go forth in our name, spend the people's money, and stir up trouble and unrest, and then come back here and unload the whole thing upon us. We should not encourage it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize—

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, what is pending now before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion to strike out the last word in the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I think that is out of order, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] has submitted an amendment to the House, so that if the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio is voted on the motion is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is to amend the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. If that is the case, I make the point of order that the gentleman must speak on the amendment.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, is not the gentleman willing that we shall follow the ordinary customs of the House and debate the amendment more fully?

Mr. KEATING. I will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I have no desire to interfere with debate unnecessarily. One week ago we had two hours under the rule—

Mr. GILLETT. That was general debate.

Mr. KEATING. General debate, and with the consent of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] who was present, and of his colleagues on that side of the House, the use of those two hours was waived, with the understanding that we would proceed with the discussion of amendments. Now, I submit, in all fairness to the gentleman from Massachusetts, that much of the discussion which we have had here this morning has nothing to do with the amendment, but is in the nature of general debate, and that we are occupying time which other gentlemen of the House desire to use in the consideration of another bill. When we adjourned on last Wednesday it was with the distinct understanding that we would take up this joint resolution under the five-minute rule and confine ourselves to a discussion of amendments. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] had been present on last Wednesday and had desired to discuss this amendment, having charge of the time on this side of the House I would gladly have yielded him time. I made a general offer to the Members of the House on Wednesday of time for the discussion of this resolution. Under the circumstances I submit that the gentleman should confine himself to the amendment before the committee.

Mr. TOWNER. Before the gentleman from Colorado sits down will he permit me to make this suggestion to him? This amendment necessarily carries with it the consideration of the entire question. It would hardly be possible to consider this amendment without discussing the merits of the entire proposition, and I want to make this further suggestion to the gentleman: Only a few moments ago there was a vote taken by the committee regarding the shutting off of debate, and the committee, by a very large vote, decided not to do it, manifesting, I think, to the satisfaction of anyone, that they desired to discuss it further. Now, does not the gentleman think that he, in charge of the bill, ought to submit to the evident desire of the committee to discuss an important proposition of this sort further?

Mr. KEATING. I am always glad to submit to the will of the House very cheerfully, but I did not understand that the motion which was made was to suspend the rules of the House, and the rules of the House provide that when an amendment is offered the gentleman who addresses himself to the amendment shall confine himself to that. But I will say to the gentleman that I have no desire to interfere unnecessarily with debate. I think in all fairness to other gentlemen who have business coming before the House this afternoon that we should endeavor to dispose of this bill as soon as possible. But for the time being I will not press the point.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the subject matter of this paragraph, and I have the right to do that under the rules.

I want to emphasize as strongly as I can the argument advanced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and the argument just advanced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. This proposition now presented to the House involves the selection of an important and an expensive commission, authorized to do extensive traveling in this country or wherever they may desire to travel, with an expensive equipment of stenographers, secretaries, and clerks, just as big as they want to make it, and with the authority to create here a whole library of books upon these important subjects. I am wondering where the money is to come from for all these tremendous expenses. Facing a budget that will amount to \$5,000,000,000 at least, in time of war, when the period is abnormal, when all conditions are abnormal, we are asked here in the resolution which is submitted to inquire into the cause of unemployment, to look into systems of insurance, voluntary and obligatory, to find out how we are providing to meet unemployment, invalidity, and sickness in the future, and to examine and report on a number of other similar matters, including insurance against sickness and old-age pensions. In other words,

in the most abnormal period that ever occurred in the history of the world we are asked to make these investigations, with a view to determining what our career as a Nation in the future may be when normal times are restored. The time has come for Members of this body not to get their pictures in a Washington newspaper because they advocate all sorts of raids on the Treasury of the United States—the time has come for a Congress which is courageous enough to send 2,000,000 men, and more than that if necessary, to the French front to work there in trenches for \$30 a month—the time has come to show whether we are courageous enough to stop bills of this kind. [Applause.] I am irrevocably against this joint resolution and everything that is in it at this time. These measures, which are purely and absolutely socialistic, ought to be considered in a period of normal times, rather than in a period of abnormal times. This looks to still further tremendous increases in our enormous budget.

An important convention is in progress in this city to-day, if it did not conclude its work yesterday, for the purpose of determining upon equitable methods of taxing, and the method they seem to favor there is to compel the rich, the large incomes, to pay all the expenses of this war and nearly everything else. At the same time, from the capitalistic centers of this country, there issue all sorts of complaints against the kind of taxes we are levying now. The man in this House who belongs to one of these war committees, who with flags flying bring in these war measures, becomes tremendously popular here; but the man on the committee charged with raising the money and with levying the taxes to pay all these enormous expenses becomes the butt of all sorts of ridicule and criticism. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, in order to bring the matter to a conclusion, I offer as a substitute a motion to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. KEATING. I make the point of order that that comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHERLEY moves to strike out the enacting clause of the joint resolution.

Mr. KEATING. I make the point of order that the motion is made too late.

The CHAIRMAN. On what ground?

Mr. KEATING. On the ground that the gentleman from Illinois has offered an amendment, and that the motion to strike out the enacting clause must be made before the other amendment is offered.

The CHAIRMAN. This motion is in order at any time before the reading of the bill has been completed. The point of order of the gentleman from Colorado is overruled. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KEATING. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and the yeas were 101 and the nays were 31.

So the motion prevailed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUBEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration House joint resolution 189, to provide for a commission to inquire into the advisability of establishing national insurance against unemployment, invalidity, and sickness, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the report, in the nature of an amendment, to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-two Members present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 133, not voting 95, as follows:

Almon
Anthony
Aswell

Austin
Bacharach
Bankhead

Bell
Black
Blackmon

Blanton
Booher
Borland

Brand
Browning
Buchanan
Burnett
Burroughs
Butler
Byrnes, S. C.
Byrnes, Tenn.
Campbell, Kans.
Caraway
Carlin
Carter, Mass.
Carter, Okla.
Chandler, N. Y.
Chandler, Okla.
Clark, Pa.
Classon
Collier
Connally, Tex.
Cooper, Ohio
Cooper, W. Va.
Crago
Cramton
Crisp
Currie, Mich.
Dallinger
Darrow
Dempsey
Denison
Dent
Dies
Dominick
Doughton
Dupré
Dyer
Eagan
Elliott
Ellsworth
Esch
Fess
Flood
Fordney
Foss
Freeman
Fuller, Ill.
Garrett, Tenn.
Gillett

Glynn
Godwin, N. C.
Good
Goodwin, Ark.
Gordon
Gould
Gray, Ala.
Gray, N. J.
Green, Iowa
Gregg
Griest
Hadley
Hamilton, Mich.
Harrison, Va.
Haugen
Hayes
Healin
Helm
Hicks
Holland
Hollingsworth
Houston
Hull, Tenn.
Husted
Hutchinson
Ireland
Johnson, Wash.
Jones, Tex.
Kahn
Kearns
Kehoe
Kelley, Mich.
Kennedy, Iowa
Key, Ohio
Kincheloe
Langley
Larsen
Lazaro
Lee, Ga.
Leibach
Lenroot
Lever
Linthicum
Lobeck
Longworth
McAndrews
McArthur

McClintic
McFadden
McKenzie
McKinley
McLaughlin, Mich.
Madden
Magee
Mansfield
Martin
Meeker
Merritt
Miller, Minn.
Montague
Moon
Moore, Pa.
Moore, Ind.
Nicholls, S. C.
Norton
Oldfield
Oliver, Ala.
Olney
Overmyer
Overstreet
Palge
Park
Parker, N. J.
Peters
Platt
Porter
Pou
Powers
Price
Railey
Ramsey
Rayburn
Reed
Robinson
Rogers
Romjue
Rouse
Rowe
Rucker
Russell
Sanders, Ind.
Sanders, La.
Sanders, N. Y.
Scott, Mich.

Sears
Sherley
Shouse
Shouse
Sisson
Slayden
Slomp
Sloan
Small
Snook
Snyder
Stafford
Steagall
Stedman
Steele
Steenerson
Stephens, Miss.
Stephens, Nebr.
Sterling, Ill.
Sterling, Pa.
Stevenson
Stiness
Sweet
Switzer
Talbott
Taylor, Ark.
Temple
Tillman
Timberlake
Tinkham
Towner
Treadway
Venable
Vinson
Walker
Walsh
Wason
Watson, Va.
Weaver
Webb
Welling
Welty
Williams
Wilson, Ill.
Wilson, La.
Wilson, Tex.
Wood, Ind.

NAYS—133.

Alexander
Anderson
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baer
Beakes
Beshlin
Bland
Brodbeck
Browne
Caldwell
Campbell, Pa.
Cary
Connelly, Kans.
Cooper, Wis.
Crosier
Dale, N. Y.
Davidson
Decker
Denton
Dickinson
Dill
Dillon
Dixon
Doolittle
Dowell
Drane
Elston
Emerson
Fairchild, B. L.
Fairfield
Farr
Ferris
Fields

Fisher
Focht
Foster
French
Gallagher
Gallivan
Gandy
Gard
Garner
Garrett, Tex.
Graham, Ill.
Hamlin
Haskell
Hastings
Hayden
Helvering
Hensley
Hersey
Hilliard
Howard
Huddleston
Hull, Iowa
Humphreys
Igoe
Jacoway
James
Johnson, Ky.
Juul
Keating
Kelly, Pa.
Kettner
Kliss, Pa.
King
Kinkaid

Knutson
Kraus
La Follette
Lea, Cal.
Leshner
Little
Littlepage
London
Lonergan
Lundeen
Lunn
McCormick
McCulloch
McKeown
McLemore
Maher
Mapes
Mason
Mondell
Morgan
Morin
Mott
Nolan
Osborne
Phelan
Purnell
Quin
Raker
Ramseyer
Randall
Rankin
Robbins
Roberts
Rodenberg

Rose
Rube
Schall
Scott, Iowa
Sells
Shackelford
Shallenberger
Sherwood
Siegel
Sims
Sinnott
Smith, Mich.
Smith, C. B.
Summers
Swift
Tague
Taylor, Colo.
Thomas
Thompson
Van Dyke
Vestal
Voigt
Volstead
Waldow
Walton
Watkins
Wheeler
White, Me.
Wingo
Woods, Iowa
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—95.

Barkley
Barnhart
Bowers
Britten
Brumbaugh
Candler, Miss.
Cannon
Cantrill
Capstick
Carew
Church
Clark, Fla.
Claypool
Coady
Copley
Costello
Cox
Curry, Cal.
Dale, Vt.
Davis
Dewalt
Dooling
Doremus
Drukker

Dunn
Eagle
Edmonds
Estopinal
Evans
Fairchild, G. W.
Flynn
Francis
Frear
Fuller, Mass.
Garland
Glass
Goodall
Graham, Pa.
Greene, Mass.
Greene, Vt.
Hamill
Hamilton, N. Y.
Hardy
Harrison, Miss.
Hawley
Heaton
Heintz
Hood

Johnson, S. Dak.
Jones, Va.
Kennedy, R. I.
Kitchin
Kreider
LaGuardia
Lufkin
McLaughlin, Pa.
Mann
Mays
Miller, Wash.
Mudd
Neely
Nelson
Nichols, Mich.
Oliver, N. Y.
O'Shaunessy
Padgett
Parker, N. Y.
Polk
Pratt
Ragsdale
Reavis
Riordan

Rowland
Sabath
Sanford
Saunders, Va.
Scott, Pa.
Scully
Smith, Idaho
Smith, T. F.
Snell
Strong
Sullivan
Templeton
Tilson
Vare
Ward
Watson, Pa.
Whaley
White, Ohio
Winslow
Wise
Woodyard
Young, Tex.
Zihlman

So the enacting clause was stricken out.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. COADY with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. HARDY with Mr. CURRY of California.
 Mr. EAGLE with Mr. WINSLOW.
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. WOODYARD.
 Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. ZIEHLMAN.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. TILSON.
 Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. WARD.
 Mr. JONES of Virginia with Mr. DALE of Vermont.
 Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. ROWLAND.
 Mr. WISE with Mr. DAVIS.
 Mr. CHURCH with Mr. STRONG.
 Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. DRUKKER.
 Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. TEMPLETON.
 Mr. DEWALT with Mr. HAWLEY.
 Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi with Mr. CANNON.
 Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MANN.
 Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. DUNN.
 Mr. CLAYPOOL with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.
 Mr. BARKLEY with Mr. GARLAND.
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. REAVIS.
 Mr. OLIVER of New York with Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. PARKER of New York.
 Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. GOODALL.
 Mr. EVANS with Mr. FRANCIS.
 Mr. MAYS with Mr. EDMONDS.
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. BOWERS.
 Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. PADGETT with Mr. SANFORD.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. HEATON.
 Mr. HOOD with Mr. FREAR.
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. SNELL.
 Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia with Mr. BRITTEN.
 Mr. NEELY with Mr. MUDD.
 Mr. BARNHART with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. GREENE of Vermont.
 Mr. POLK with Mr. COPELY.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. PRATT.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. COSTELLO.
 Mr. WHALEY with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.
 The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.
 A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER. When Mr. Fitzgerald resigned from the House, although he did not necessarily have to do so, he also resigned from the House Office Building Commission. The Chair appoints in his place the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. SHERLEY, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

MINIMUM WAGE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MAHER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 152) to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this bill is not in order in view of the special order of the House made on December 12 whereby the bills then on the calendar were first to be disposed of, and that then the bill H. R. 269 was to be given a privileged status for consideration. I call the Speaker's attention to the special order that was made on that day, the last Calendar Wednesday before the holiday recess. At that time the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] said:

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the bills now on the calendar which are in order on Calendar Wednesday are disposed of that the bill which we have just a moment ago considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union—H. R. 269—be in order on Calendar Wednesday.

That fixes that bill as virtually the unfinished business of the House, after the bills then on the calendar have been disposed of on Calendar Wednesday. The bill that the gentleman from New York now attempts to bring up for consideration was not on the calendar on that date, but was reported only on January 14, 1918. The reason why I make the point of order is this: The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having in charge the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill is considering very thoroughly the question of an increase of salary of all of the Government employees whose compensation is fixed in that bill. It is also proposed, I believe, to provide for a general percentage increase of all Government employees.

The SPEAKER. That has nothing to do with the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think it will be inopportune to bring this bill up for consideration at this time.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MAHER. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], in charge of that bill, is not present in the Hall.

The SPEAKER. If any gentleman from his committee desires to call it up, it is in order.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. Is there any gentleman here who desires to press that bill?

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair desires to learn. If any gentleman on Mr. HAYDEN's committee desires to call up the bill 269, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully contend that the order of the House is a call of committees.

The SPEAKER. The committees are now being called.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NOLAN. Does the Chair interpret the unanimous-consent order of Mr. KITCHIN to mean that the Committee on Labor is to be deprived of its two full days?

The SPEAKER. No. The Committee on Labor is not to be deprived of its two full days, but it is the special order of the House that that particular bill take precedence.

Mr. NOLAN. Suppose they get the consent of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that we may go on?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, I shall waive any right that I may have under the special rule, because after investigation I find that it is not workable.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the order of the House having been made, no gentleman of the House can set it aside, except by unanimous consent. The order of the House is a fixed order of proceeding, and it is beyond the power of the gentleman from Arizona to set it aside.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, the situation in respect to the special rule is that it was ordered that my bill, H. R. 269, should have precedence over any bills placed on the calendar after that date, but that all bills then on the calendar should be disposed of before my bill was considered.

The SPEAKER. Have they not all been disposed of?

Mr. STAFFORD. Only from the Committee on Labor, Mr. Speaker, and I have made the point of order that this bill which the gentleman from New York seeks to call up now was reported after December 12, when that special order was made.

The SPEAKER. That point of order is good. Has the committee any bill that was on the calendar before the 12th of December? If so, the Chair will recognize any gentleman on that committee to call it up.

Mr. MAHER. No; we have not.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. What difference does it make whether it was reported before the 12th of December or not?

The SPEAKER. Because there is a special order of the House to that effect.

Mr. LONDON. I know; but that special order is out of the way now.

The SPEAKER. No; it is not. The special order provides that when bills already on the calendar are disposed of that Mr. HAYDEN's bill shall have precedence over what are put on the calendar afterwards.

Mr. LONDON. I know, but the Hayden bill is out of the way now.

The SPEAKER. How does the gentleman determine that?

Mr. LONDON. I asked the Speaker to ask the House whether anybody was going to press the Hayden bill, and we have the statement before the House now that the Hayden bill is withdrawn, and all of the rights that he has under that rule have been waived.

Mr. SHERLEY. He can not waive the right. There is an order of the House and the Hayden bill is not in order until every bill that was on the calendar has been disposed of—

The SPEAKER. That was on the calendar prior to the 12th of December.

Mr. SHERLEY. Prior to the date of the order.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that the House has just been considering a bill that was placed on the calendar after December 12.

The SPEAKER. But nobody raised the point of order; if so, it would have been knocked out. The Chair can not go around hunting up points of order; he has enough to do anyhow. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk began to call the committees.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Colorado rise?

Mr. KEATING. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Now, the Committee on Labor, under the rules of the House, would be entitled to two full days. The

committee has occupied less than one full day. The Chair now rules, as I understand it, that the roll of committees shall be called because of this unanimous-consent arrangement. May I ask the Chair when the Committee on Labor will have another opportunity to present its business to the House?

The SPEAKER. Here is the way of it: Each committee has two days if it has business enough to occupy two days. If it has not enough grist to occupy the time the Chair causes the roster to be called and you go on. The Committee on Labor will be called when the wheel again revolves.

Mr. KEATING. But the Committee on Labor has business and is prepared to go on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows, but it is out of order under this special order. How that special order came to be made the Chair does not know. It is a good deal of a puzzle to the Chair to know why that thing was fixed that way.

Mr. KEATING. The Chair holds all bills which were not on the calendar on the date that special order was adopted can not be considered?

The SPEAKER. That is exactly what the Chair holds, until we get through with the bills which were on the calendar prior to the 12th.

Mr. KEATING. Then, do we revert, for instance, to the Committee on Labor?

The SPEAKER. You do not. If that committee has any bill that is in order, why it can call it up right now, but if it is not in order you can not call it up. Now here is this special order—

Mr. KEATING. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, despite the special order, the House now proceed to the consideration of this minimum-wage bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent—

Mr. RAINEY. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk called the Committee on Patents.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a point of order—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. That there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-six gentlemen are present—not a quorum.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves a call of the House.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. LONDON and Mr. STAFFORD. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 65, noes 91.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California demands tellers.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. NOLAN. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 116, noes 51.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California demands the yeas and nays. Twenty-one gentlemen have risen in the affirmative, not a sufficient number.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is not necessary to have a quorum to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The House can adjourn without a quorum.

ADJOURNMENT.

So the motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 17, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports from accounting officers of this department showing what officers of the Government were delinquent in rendering their accounts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 810); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Depart-

ment of the Treasury to provide an interest teller for the office of the Treasurer of the United States for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 811); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SINNOTT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5489) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange for lands in private ownership lands formerly embraced in the grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 241), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 8745) fixing the salaries of the clerks of the United States district courts; prescribing how and when they shall account for the fees collected; providing for the office expenses of such clerks, including salaries of deputy clerks and clerical assistants; and for the travel and subsistence expense of such clerks and their deputies when necessarily absent from their official residences; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 8746) to provide for the construction of a military road from the arsenal at Rock Island, Ill., to the proving grounds for artillery in Carroll and Jo Daviess Counties, Ill., and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8747) to provide for the construction of a military road from the arsenal at Rock Island, Ill., to the proving grounds for artillery in Carroll and Jo Daviess Counties, Ill., and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8748) to provide for a survey of the Cowlitz River, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8749) providing for the appraisal and sale of the Gig Harbor abandoned military reservation, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8750) to amend the law granting second-class mail privileges to certain publications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 8751) to amend section 203, Title II, of the act entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," approved September 8, 1916; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 8752) for the grading of Fourth Street SE., and construction of a bridge over Oxon Run; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 8753) to amend section 3, Title I, of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 8754) amending the act of August 29, 1916, chapter 415, and a part of section 20 of the act of February 4, 1887, chapter 104, as amended, relating to bills of lading, receipts, and agreements of common carriers and the limitation of liability by common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 8755) authorizing a survey with a view to protection of the beach at and near Sea Bright, N. J., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 8756) to provide an allowance to rural mail carriers for expenses; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 8757) for the erection of a military post at or near the city of Vicksburg, in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8758) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station at a point near the city of Jackson, in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8759) providing for an addition to the Federal courthouse and post-office building at Jackson, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 8760) to create the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8761) to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of coal, oil, copper, iron, and other metalliferous minerals, timber, and water power; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURRY of California: A bill (H. R. 8762) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to create an antidepreciation fund with which to purchase at par certain war-loan or Liberty loan bonds that may be offered for sale below par, and to prohibit bond brokers, stock-exchange brokers, or bankers from buying or offering to buy or from selling or offering to sell said war-loan or liberty bonds at less than par, making such action a felony, and providing punishment therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 8763) to amend the act entitled "An act to extend temporarily the time for filing applications and fees and taking action in the United States Patent Office in favor of nations granting reciprocal rights to United States citizens," approved August 17, 1916; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 8764) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Union; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 8765) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Geese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8766) granting a pension to Joseph Hutzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8767) granting a pension to Wesley P. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8768) granting an increase of pension to James S. Squire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8769) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Grube; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8770) granting a pension to William W. I. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 8771) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Lanphear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8772) for the relief of H. H. Hogan; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 8773) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius L. Lepore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8774) granting an increase of pension to Moses Goldstein; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8775) granting an increase of pension to George S. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 8776) granting an increase of pension to Hiram W. Covill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8777) granting a pension to J. H. Kissinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8778) granting an increase of pension to Anton Ohnesorg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 8779) granting a pension to Rachael S. Dobbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8780) for the relief of the heirs of John Wixon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8781) for the relief of the heirs or estate of David S. Sexton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8782) for the relief of the heirs of Harriet B. Selma, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8783) for the relief of J. W. Cain, Morde Fuller, Charles Van Buren, and H. C. Perry; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8784) for the relief of the heirs of Isaac Whitaker, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8785) for the relief of the legal representative of Ann D. Halsey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8786) for the relief of the legal representatives of James W. Brabston and Roche H. Brabston; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8787) for the relief of James Richards, administrator of the estate of William Richards, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8788) for the relief of the estate of W. L. Johnston; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8789) for the relief of Thomas H. Jett; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8790) for the relief of Maria Elizabeth Burnett; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8791) for the relief of the heirs or estate of William J. Milligan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8792) for the relief of the estate of John P. Gee; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8793) for the relief of Dr. G. Y. Hicks, Vicksburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 8794) granting a pension to L. Ethel Bolton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 8795) granting an increase of pension to James H. Handy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8796) granting an increase of pension to Amos C. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8797) granting a pension to Hans Fulson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 8798) for the relief of the legal representative of Enoch Ensley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 8799) granting a pension to William W. Hartigan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8800) granting a pension to Amelia Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8801) granting a pension to John O'Neil; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 8802) granting a pension to Sylvia Ferington; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 8803) granting an increase of pension to John R. Worth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 8804) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Snook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8805) granting an increase of pension to Herbert E. Roberson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 8806) granting an increase of pension to William S. Eberman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8807) granting a pension to Malvina A. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8808) to amend the military record of William R. Paget; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 8809) granting an increase of pension to William H. Steinmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 8810) granting a pension to Jeremiah H. Worthley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 8811) granting a pension to Annie Sangamo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON: A bill (H. R. 8812) granting an increase of pension to William C. Benning; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8813) granting an increase of pension to Thaddeus M. Kelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 8814) for the relief of Edith B. Macon, sole heir of the estate of David W. and Elizabeth L. W. Bailey, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 8815) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8816) granting a pension to Minnie L. Cahill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 8817) granting a pension to Frederick Blackledge, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8818) granting a pension to Maggie Lee Oliver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8819) granting a pension to William W. Fuller; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: Resolution adopted by the Burlington County (N. J.) Board of Agriculture, asking for exemption from military service of farm operators and farm laborers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of W. E. Sweet, Dr. J. W. Wright, Frank E. Bond, James D. Johnson, and 18 others; also, a petition of J. L. Whalen, George M. Lyle, Harry Mehl, M. C. Cornell, and 18 others; also, a petition of Rev. W. P. Murray, H. A. Strong, Dr. O. N. Chaffee, and 16 others, all praying for the passage of House bill 7995, for the preservation of Perry's flagship; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a petition and copy of the the Perry Centennial Book of Past National Commander George R. Downs, Army and Navy Union, to accompany House bill 7995; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of many citizens of New Jersey, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for an increase in the salaries of the city letter carriers and post-office clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

My Mr. ESCH: Papers in support of House bill 795, granting a pension to George K. Redmond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISHER: Petition of M. L. B. Ensley; also, abstract of printed evidence and a statement relative to a claim of Enoch Ensley for 77 bales of cotton used by the United States Army; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 8309, for the relief of Caroline Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 8053, for the relief of William Hockenbrought; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against the zone system for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of B. B. Martin and sundry other citizens of Blandinsville, Ill., for the repeal of zone rates on second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of Jennie B. Kern, Elizabeth Lovins, Mary L. Frantz, Lena Auslander, A. Lampert, M. M. Kern, Charlie N. Roberts, R. J. McRae, H. M. Clark, B. Cohen, J. B. Hewitt, N. Cramer, A. T. Milstein, N. Halpern, J. Suponick, N. Brookman, L. Kerlick, N. Waltson, A. G. Mann, Max Solisch, J. A. Lovin, S. Lampert, S. L. Skoss, Sarah M. Skoss, and M. Bilkon, all of Denver, Colo., urging the passage of the Keating bill, granting an increase of pay to Government employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Peter G. and Mary E. Miller, of Denver, Colo., urging passage of House bill 1654, granting increase in pay of post-office clerks and letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Baltimore Branch of the Pharmaceutical Association, favoring bill for the organization of a pharmaceutical corps in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Susan Collins, of Baltimore, Md., relative to appropriation for maintaining the kindergarten division of the Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Carr-Lowrey Glass Co., of Baltimore, Md., against repeal of increased postage on second-class matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of Local Board of Exemption No. 1, Pawtucket, R. I., protesting against the exemption of aliens who have not yet become full-fledged citizens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the Rhode Island Council of Defense urging legislation permitting the induction of aliens not alien enemies into the military service under the selective act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWLAND: Resolution passed by the John S. Melvil Post, No. 141, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bradford, Pa.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of the Woman's Club of Lake Placid, N. Y., protesting against the postal increase by zones on periodicals, and urging a repeal of the present law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employees of United States customs service, port of Maline, N. Y., urging increase in salary of Federal employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 17, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we ask Thy guidance and blessing upon the labor of this day, that it may be done under the inspiration of Thy holy Spirit, that we may have an eye single to Thy glory, and that the accomplishments of the day may add to the happiness and prosperity of all the people whom we serve. For Christ's sake. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1918.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the chair during my absence.

WILLARD SAULSBURY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BANKHEAD thereupon assumed the chair.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Hitchcock	New	Sterling
Beckham	Johnson, Cal.	Norris	Stone
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Poinsette	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Pomeroy	Thomas
Curtis	Kellogg	Ransdell	Tillman
Fernald	Kirby	Robinson	Townsend
Fletcher	Knox	Shafroth	Trammell
Gallinger	McKellar	Sheppard	Vardaman
Gerry	McLean	Simmons	Wadsworth
Gronna	McNary	Smith, Ga.	Watson
Hale	Martin	Smith, Md.	Weeks
Harding	Myers	Smith, S. C.	Wolcott
Hardwick	Nelson	Smoot	

Mr. TOWNSEND. I announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan]. He is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. MYERS. My colleague [Mr. WALSH] is still detained from the Senate by illness. He is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] for the day.

Mr. RANDELL. I wish to announce the continued absence of my colleague [Mr. BROUSSARD] on account of illness.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] are detained on important business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. THOMAS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER announced his signature to the bill (S. 3235) amending section 32, Federal farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House.

PETITIONS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Rural Letter Carriers' Association of Grafton County, N. H., praying for an increase in the salaries of rural letter carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented a petition of the Pan Handle Agricultural Club of Brooke County, W. Va., praying for the conservation of food, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SMOOT. I present a petition from Prof. William H. Hart and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing with the view of publishing the same as a public document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so referred.